







11
A
STATEMENT

OF THE
PROCEEDINGS

OF THE
PRESBYTERY OF GLASGOW,

RELATIVE TO THE USE OF AN
ORGAN IN ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH,

In the Public Worship of God.

TO WHICH IS ANNEXED,

AN ADDRESS

TO THE REVEREND JUDICATORIES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES;

By a Lay Member.

PHILADELPHIA.

PRINTED FOR THE PUBLISHERS; AND SOLD BY D. HOGAN.

J. Anderson, Printer.

1821.

BX9187
.G5

6497
.01

PREFACE

FOR THE AMERICAN EDITION.

TO those who profess to maintain any steady and uniform adherence to the constitutional standards of the Presbyterian church, in these States, or to the purity and simplicity of Gospel worship, it is hoped that the following Discussion, however distant as to local situation, will not prove uninteresting.

In every period of the church of Christ, its truth and simplicity have been invaded, not only by the propensity of the world at large, but even that of its own professors themselves, to a sensual and pompous worship. Not all the express and positive precepts, nor all the blessed example of its divine Author himself, have been, even to this day, effectual for the entire suppression and restraint of these vain and delusive workings of the unregenerated hearts of the children of men.

In that tribute of homage and praise, especially, which we owe to our God and Saviour, and that too, in all the renovated and exalted strain of evangelical gratitude, how prone are we, individually and collectively, to listen to the syren sounds of sensual delusion; and even to aim at the wafting of our holiest aspirations to heaven, through the medium of other sounds than those that can issue from the heart?

In Old Testament times, indeed, when mental and spiritual exercise had few, if any, means of being sublimated from the grossness of sensual delusion, it pleased God to indulge his people and worshipping servants, with some condescension to their weakness and imperfection, in this respect. In divine consistency, however, with his most gracious purposes, as well as with his promises of a more spiritual worship, those very means he converted into types and shadows of those more

simple, spiritual and sublime joys, which his church was to exercise and enjoy under the Gospel.

This Gospel, in all its spiritual and simplified effulgence, we do enjoy, agreeably to his most gracious promise. It has been committed to us, in all its perfection of truth, as well as in that purity and simplicity exhibited in the example of our Lord and his apostles. The Gospel day hath indeed dawned on a sensual and benighted world. Some of its meridian rays have indeed arisen upon us; and yet, alas! how reluctant do we seem, that those shadows, which have so long obscured them, should, for ever, “flee away”?

The inroads, therefore, whether more secret or more avowed, which have been, and still continue to be, made on the purest features of the Gospel service, in every corner of the Christian church, should be the subject of our deepest regret.

Without extending our views to distant situations, or to different denominations from those professing any faithful adherence to our “Directory for Worship,” so solemnly adopted—adopted with all the holy sanctity of obligatory vows, how awful should be our reflections on any innovations? How conscious of having incurred the guilt of a tacit acquiescence with wilful aberration from spiritual worship; and, in this respect, an *unsanctioned* conformity to the pride and fashions of this world?

In the nominally Christian world, under this sad delusion, many still retain in their public service of God, such incense, as is felt to be most agreeable to their sense of odoriferous perfume and fragrance.—Others can find but little relish for religious service, but through the luxurious symphony of instrumental and vocal sound; and that under the direction, not of the most pious, but rather of the most refined proficient in the musical art—While not a few, who would seem to have a more exalted and sublime sense of Gospel worship, are led to succumb and to acquiesce; under the timid apprehension of being considered, either destitute of all refinement and taste, or as weakly wedded

to a mode of praising God, too unembellished for polished society; however sanctioned it may have been by the example of our Lord and Master.

Thus do we find, that not only does depravity receive countenance in holy things; but that, while we become the illegitimate compliers with the advocates of musical harmony of sound; we are promoting jarring and discord in the church of Christ; and substituting for the discountenanced simplicity of that service, whose melodies can flow only from the heart, a vain and pompous combination of sounds, that not seldom puts to silence more than one half the worshippers, even in the house of God.

Let the impartial weigh these awful considerations. Instances are become too notorious to escape the observation even of the ungodly themselves. Are not such innovations either totally winked at, or shamefully acquiesced with, by those whose sacred office it is to inculcate a far different spirit and practice?

Is it not true, that in some of our churches, individuals, of conscientious feeling in this respect, have refused to minister? Has not the aged and devout worshipper, rather than comply, for *example's* sake to his family, been induced to walk out, after service had commenced, with his Bible in the one hand, and his Psalm Book in the other?

Has this innovation hitherto excited no division—occasioned no discord in any church? Is there no instance among us, of its rising over all regard for congregational privilege and right. Has it subjected no individual member or minister, opposed to such an inroad, to not only an exemption from any thing like brotherly kindness, but to an obloquy bordering on persecution itself?

If to these inquiries no negative reply can be given—and that such a state of things actually exists, and is allowed to pass on without notice or censure—What, may we not ask, is become of the watchmen of Zion? What avail our inquiries, or our reports, on this head, in the churches within our connexion? Or, may it

not be reasonably asked, What mounds or bulwarks can we hope to see successful, for guarding and securing the purity and simplicity of Gospel worship?

From the following interesting Discussion, we learn, how innovations are attempted; and, also, how they have been successfully resisted, in a most respectable portion of the Presbyterian church; not less acquainted, surely, than we are, with those principles on which it was founded at the Reformation. On some occasions, we seem jealous, and not seldom justly, of foreign aberrations from ministerial fidelity, as well as from the truths of the Gospel. But, "laying aside all partiality," let us be equally jealous over ourselves; and, while we deem it to be our sacred duty "to bear and forbear" with one another, in our own infirmities, as well with those of others, not in our connexion; let us, nevertheless, be carefully and zealously alive to a just discrimination between what this duty demands, and a criminal acquiescence with *unsanctioned* innovations, either in doctrine or in worship. Whatever tends to sap the constitutional foundation on which alone these can and should rest, can never be smoothed over as a point of minor importance—can receive neither salvo nor authority for the turpitude of acquiescence, under any pretext whatever.

To be instrumental, in any degree, in maintaining the purity of our church against all innovation, and especially in public and social worship, has been the sole motive of those who have had the principal share in submitting the following publication to the consideration of their fellow Christians; and, in whatever spirit it may be received, or however useful, or otherwise, it may be found for that design, they shall, at least, have satisfied the dictates of their own consciences; and leave the issue with HIM, who alone can give success to all they can aim at, for his glory, and for his praise upon earth.

May, 1821.

CONTENTS.

Minute of the Presbytery of Glasgow, Sept. 2d, 1807,	Page 1
First Letter, Lord Provost to the Presbytery, 26th August, 1807,	1
Extract from the City Council Records of Glasgow, September 8th, 1806,	2
Dr. Ritchie's Letter to Provost John Hamilton,	3
Petition of Gentlemen who possess Seats in St. Andrew's Church, to City Council,	4
Mr. Reddie's Letter, 6th September, 1806,	7
First Letter, the Lord Provost to Dr. Ritchie, 22d August, 1807,	12
Dr. Ritchie's Answer to the Lord Provost,	13
Second Letter, the Lord Provost to Dr. Ritchie, 26th August, 1807,	13
Second Letter of the Lord Provost to the Presbytery, 2d September, 1807,	15
Minute of Presbytery, September 2d, 1807,	16
Minute of Presbytery, October 7th, 1807,	17
Minute of Presbytery, November 4th, 1807,	18
Reasons of Dissent, 13th October, 1807,	18
Answers to Reasons of Dissent, 2d December, 1807,	22
Minute of Presbytery, January 6th, 1808,	46
Dr. Taylor's, jun. Explanation, January 5th, 1808,	46
Dr. Lockhart's Explanation,	51

CONTENTS.

Dr. Ritchie's Statement, 6th January, 1808, . . .	Page 53
Minutes of Presbytery, February 3d, and March 30th, 1808, . . .	82
Answer for the Presbytery to Dr. Ritchie's Statement, . . .	83
Minute of Presbytery, May 4th, 1808,	175
Conclusion,	178

Address to the Judicatories of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States,	193
Copy of a Letter to the Incorporated Committee, &c. . .	212

STATEMENT, &c.

Minute of the Presbytery of Glasgow.

September 2d, 1807.

TWO letters from the Lord Provost of the city of Glasgow, respecting an Organ having been introduced into St. Andrew's church, were produced and read. Also produced and read, copy of letters, Provost Mackenzie and Dr. Ritchie;—and extract from the records of the Town Council of Glasgow. The tenor of all the foresaid productions follows.

First Letter Lord Provost to the Presbytery.

REV. SIR,

Glasgow, 26th August, 1807.

In discharge of the legal duty incumbent on civil magistrates, patrons of churches, and heritors of parishes, I beg leave, on the part of the magistrates and council of this city, to intimate to the reverend Presbytery of Glasgow, that, according to information I have received, an Organ has recently been placed in St. Andrew's church, by the minister and congregation of that parish,

and was used on Sunday last, while the congregation was assembled for the purpose of divine worship.

Whether the introduction of Organs into our established churches, be an improvement or not, is the province of the ecclesiastical judicatories, not of the civil magistrates, to determine. And that the reverend Presbytery may know the line of conduct which the magistrates and council have thought it right to observe on this occasion, I transmit a copy of the answer which they returned in the month of September last, to an application from the minister and congregation of St. Andrew's church; and also copies of two official letters which I have addressed to the Rev. Dr. Ritchie on the subject, and of his answer to one of them.—I am, with much respect,

Rev. Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed)

JAMES MACKENZIE,
Lord Provost.

The Rev. Dr. WILLIAM TAYLOR, Moderator of the Presbytery of Glasgow. }

Extract from the Town Council Records of Glasgow.

At Glasgow, the eighth day of September, eighteen hundred and six years;

Which day the magistrates and council of the city of Glasgow, being in council assembled, The Lord Provost* laid before the magistrates and

* Provost John Hamilton.

council a letter from the Rev. Dr. Ritchie, minister of St. Andrew's church, and a petition from a number of respectable inhabitants who possess seats in that church, requesting the permission of the magistrates and council, as heritors, to make such alterations in the seats behind the pulpit, as may be requisite for the introduction of an Organ. Of which letter and petition the tenor follows:

MY LORD,

Glasgow, 21st August, 1806.

I take the liberty of requesting your lordship to lay before the magistrates and council of the city of Glasgow, the petition herewith transmitted by the congregation of St. Andrew's church. Anxious as I am for the success of a request by a united congregation, I am equally anxious that our magistrates and council should pronounce a sentence worthy of themselves and the office with which they are invested. No law, so far as I have either read or heard, has ever been made with regard to Organs. I hope, therefore, that the judgment of the council, whatever it be, shall be expressed in language that conveys neither approbation nor disapprobation of instrumental music in churches: But that the petition shall be granted or refused, merely on the ground of expediency or in expediency as to the removal of the seats. To this alone, in my opinion, the jurisdiction of heritors extends. In giving this opinion, I have no desire to dictate to my superiors what line of conduct they ought to pursue, but to discover my wish, that the decision given may be such, as to maintain in the esteem of their fellow-citizens, of their country, and of Europe, that high reputation for liberality, combined with prudence, which has hitherto distinguished those

who preside over the interests of the city of Glasgow.—I have the honour to remain,

With due sentiments of respect,

My Lord,

Your lordship's most obedient servant,

(Signed) WILL. RITCHIE.

Follows the Petition.

*To the Honourable the Lord Provost, Magistrates
and Council of the City of Glasgow.*

WE, subscribers, anxious for our own improvement in sacred music, have long cherished in private, what we now hope to realize, an earnest wish of erecting an Organ in St. Andrew's church. This our wish we should never have deemed it necessary thus publicly to express, had we felt ourselves at liberty, without permission of our patrons and heritors, to make such arrangements in the church, as the placing of an Organ may require. For obtaining this permission, we address ourselves to you as our heritors, on whom lies the burden of taking care that the sitters shall not in any degree injure the church, either in its revenue or its accommodation for hearers. Every appearance of such injury we are determined to avoid, and therefore it is our request, that the proposed alterations may be carried on under the inspection of the Master of Works, and of such other gentlemen as it may be judged expedient to appoint. The question as to the propriety of using an Organ in church, it becomes us not to discuss before you, either as magistrates or heritors. This is a matter of private judgment merely, in which we alone can decide for ourselves.

We are fully persuaded, that in the execution of our plan, we violate no law either of the church or of the state. We give no offence to the prejudice of our people, for the congregation are all of one mind. We bring no new burden on the heritors, for the whole of the expense we bind ourselves to defray. We prescribe no rule of conduct to others. We only adopt what we think and feel to be for our own edification. We encroach upon no sacred privilege, no civil right of any man, or of any body of men in the kingdom. Acting thus within the limits of the law of the land, of the law of the church, and of the obligations of good neighbourhood, we cannot entertain a doubt that our scheme shall not only be permitted, but encouraged, by our enlightened heritors, who, we know, are ambitious of promoting every rational improvement; who will observe with pleasure, our attempt to advance in the knowledge and the practice of psalmody, and will gladly concur in the endeavour to rescue our national character from the reproach of having almost entirely neglected the cultivation of sacred music. Our heritors, magistrates of one of the first commercial cities of Europe, will thus give new evidence to mankind that the genius of commerce is not the contracted spirit of hostility to the liberal arts, but the enlivening sun of science, dispelling in its progress the gloomy fogs of prejudice, that have too long benumbed the energies, and untuned the feelings of our country.

Glasgow has the honour of having first made the public proposal of introducing into one of its churches the most perfect of musical instruments, and of employing it for the generous purpose of tuning the public voice for the exercise of praise.

And the present Lord Provost, and magistrates and council, will, we doubt not, eagerly embrace the opportunity of accomplishing a measure which will give additional lustre to their names, and render the period of their administration the opening of a new era in the annals of our national advancement.

May it therefore please our patrons and heritors, to grant us liberty to make such alterations in the seats behind the pulpit in St. Andrew's church, as may be requisite for carrying into execution our design. There exists not, we believe, in any parish, even in the remotest and least cultivated part of the kingdom, a body of heritors, who would not feel at least some reluctance to refuse the petition of a united people, for so very small a favour, the granting of which involves not any expense, and hurts not the claims of any human being. Your complying with our earnest request will form a new bond of attachment between our magistrates and our congregation, while it will unite the tie of private gratitude to the sentiments of public veneration, with which we implore upon their heads the blessing of Almighty God, who hath formed the ear for the delights of harmony, and whom we are bound to serve by the culture of every faculty which it hath pleased him in his goodness to bestow.

*Subscribed by a great number of gentlemen
who possess seats in St. Andrew's church.*

Which letter and petition having been read, the Lord Provost stated, that before he submitted this matter to the council, he and the other ma-

gistrates had thought it right to have the opinion of the legal advisers of the city; and that in consequence of the request of the magistrates, he received from the first town-clerk an official letter on the subject. Which letter having been also read, and the said petition and letter having been deliberately considered, the magistrates and council approve of the opinion given by Mr. Reddie; resolve to act in the manner therein suggested, with regard to the request contained in the said petition, and direct an extract of this act of council, with a copy of the said letter, to be transmitted to the Rev. Dr. Ritchie, and to the gentlemen who subscribe the petition, as the answer of the magistrates and council to the said application. Of which letter from Mr. Reddie the tenor follows:—

(COPY.)

Mr. Reddie's Letter.

Glasgow, 6th September, 1806.

MY LORD,

I have perused, and deliberately considered, the petition of a number of most respectable inhabitants, who possess seats in St. Andrew's church, requesting the permission of the magistrates and council to introduce an Organ into that church. I have also perused the letter of the Rev. Dr. Ritchie, transmitted to your lordship along with the petition. Agreeably to the direction of your lordship, and the other magistrates, I shall now, as briefly as I can, state what occurs to me on this subject. And I have no doubt, whatever resolution the magistrates and council may ultimately adopt, that they will be guided by views, at once liberal and prudent, and

that the grounds on which they proceed, will be such, as to command the respect of their fellow-citizens, and of their country.

Were I called upon to express my own individual opinion and feelings, I should, perhaps, lay claim to the honour of participating in the sentiments and wishes of the enlightened congregation of St. Andrew's church. But on this subject, my individual opinion is a matter of no importance whatever. It is my opinion, as one of the legal assessors of the city of Glasgow, that your lordship and the other magistrates require.

In the petition, and in Dr. Ritchie's letter, it seems to be hinted, that the magistrates and council have the power of granting, or refusing, the present application, "merely on the ground of expediency or in expediency, as to the removal of the seats" in the church. With me, this opinion has no weight; because I do not conceive it to be warranted by the law of the land.

Of the present application, the magistrates and council have a right to judge, in two characters, as representative heritors, and as civil magistrates.—As heritors, they have a legal right to insist, that their patrimonial interests shall not be impaired by the proposed measure. These patrimonial interests the gentlemen of the magistracy and council might, perhaps, on such an occasion, be disposed to waive, were they heritors in their own personal right. But the members of the magistracy and council are not heritors in their own right. They are heritors merely, as representing the community of Glasgow. And to the interests of that community, they are bound, on this, as on all other occasions, to attend. Whatever resolution, therefore, may be ultimate-

ly adopted, it will be necessary, that due precautions be taken, to secure effectually the pecuniary interests of the community.

But there is another, and a more important character, in which your lordship, and the other gentlemen of the magistracy, are called upon to judge of the present application; I mean, as civil magistrates.

That there is any express act of the legislature, prohibiting the use of Organs in our established churches, I am not aware. But that the introduction of Organs into our churches, would be a material alteration, and innovation in our external mode of worship, there cannot be a doubt.—The argument, which would identify an Organ with a pitchpipe, does not merit a serious answer.

Whether the use of Organs in our established churches, would be an expedient, or an inexpedient measure, in a religious and ecclesiastical view, it is unnecessary here to inquire; because your lordship and the other magistrates are not an ecclesiastical judicature, and have no right to take cognizance of the matter in that character. But, as civil magistrates, you are legally bound to maintain our constitution, in church and state, in its present condition; and by express statute, you are bound “to take order, that unity and “peace be preserved in the church.”—That there is great danger of the introduction of Organs disturbing the peace, and interrupting the harmony of the Church of Scotland, I should be sorry to suppose. At the same time, such an event is possible. Whether for the auricular gratification of one congregation, ground of offence should be afforded to other congregations, is a matter that requires serious thought. Some respect is due by

the civil magistrate, even to what many individuals may be disposed to term, the prejudices of their weaker brethren. And at all events, if any innovation in our external mode of worship be expedient and salutary, the reform, or improvement, ought to originate with the ecclesiastical branch of the government, with the constitutional guardians of our conduct, and our welfare, in such matters. When the use of Organs in our established churches has been sanctioned by our ecclesiastical legislature, then it will be the duty of your lordship and the other magistrates, not merely to permit the use of these musical instruments, but to protect in that use, those congregations, who may conceive such instruments to minister to their edification. Till the ecclesiastical branch of the constitution have sanctioned the use of Organs in our established churches, I do not see that the magistrates and council can, with any propriety, directly or indirectly, approve of such an ecclesiastical innovation.

I have been told, that the only way in which this matter can be brought before our ecclesiastical judicatures, is by a complaint and interdict. —I pretend not to be conversant with the forms of our church courts. But, I am much mistaken indeed, if our establishment be so grossly defective, as not to afford some way sufficiently formal, of obtaining the permission, or sanction, of our ecclesiastical legislature, for what may be an expedient alteration in our mode of worship.

From the language of the petition, it seems to be supposed, that were not the magistrates and council heritors of St. Andrew's church, the subscribers might, of their own authority solely, introduce an Organ. In this opinion I cannot co-

incide. To the happiness and glory of this nation, every man may worship God in the manner he thinks fit. But while unlimited toleration prevails in this country, we have at the same time an ecclesiastical establishment, recognized by law. Under that establishment, a certain mode of worship is, and has been for ages, observed. And to that mode of worship, until altered by constitutional authority, whatever Dissenters may do, the members of the Establishment are bound to conform.

In former times, the inhabitants of Glasgow stood forward, the steady supporters of civil and religious freedom. And although firmly attached to the simple and unadorned form of worship, handed down to them by their forefathers, I am convinced the gentlemen who at present compose the magistracy and council, are, at least, as anxious as any of their predecessors ever were, to promote every rational and liberal improvement. But zeal for improvement, ought to be tempered with prudence. And I own, I should be sorry indeed, were the magistrates and council of Glasgow to commit themselves so far, as to sanction, authorize, or approve, in any capacity, directly or indirectly, expressly or tacitly, what, it is possible, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in the exercise of its constitutional functions, may afterwards disapprove and prohibit.

Upon the whole, then, my opinion is, First, That the magistrates and council, as representative heritors, are bound to take such measures, as may prevent the funds of the community from sustaining any injury by the introduction of the proposed Organ; and, Secondly, That the ma-

gistrates and council ought to recommend it to the gentlemen subscribers, and to the able and learned pastor of that most respectable congregation, before proceeding farther, to apply for the permission and sanction of the ecclesiastical branch of our constitution. If the measure be expedient and salutary, there will surely be the less difficulty in obtaining that sanction. And whatever may be the result, the measure will be fully and fairly discussed by that deliberative assembly, whose province it is to take cognizance of such matters.

I have to apologize for trespassing so much on the time of your lordship. And I have the honour to be, with much respect and esteem,

My Lord,

Your lordship's faithful servant,
(Signed) JAMES REDDIE.

(COPY.)

First Letter the Lord Provost to Dr. Ritchie.

DEAR SIR,

Glasgow, 22d August, 1807.

In a conversation which took place in a company where I was yesterday, it was mentioned by a member of your congregation, that it was intended to make use of the Organ at present in St. Andrew's church of this city during divine service to-morrow, or on some Sunday soon. I beg to know if such really is your intention, because, if so, I shall consider it my duty to enter a solemn protest against you for all damages which may be the consequence.—I am, &c.

JAMES MACKENZIE.

(COPY.)

Letter from Dr. Ritchie to the Lord Provost.

MY LORD,

I have this moment had the honour of receiving your lordship's letter, relative to what you have heard about the intention expressed by the congregation of St. Andrew's church, to employ an Organ in public worship. I shall embrace the first possible opportunity of laying the Lord Provost's letter before the committee of that congregation, to whom the business of the Organ has been committed, that they may know at what risk such an attempt as that which they have in view must be made. They will, as becomes them, pay all due deference to your lordship's declaration.*

I have the honour to remain, &c.

(Signed)

WILL. RITCHIE.

Miller-Street, }
22d August, 1807. }

(COPY.)

Second Letter the Lord Provost to Dr. Ritchie.

Glasgow, 26th August, 1807.

REV. SIR,

After the answer returned by the magistrates and council of this city in the month of September

* The public may judge of the deference Dr. Ritchie paid to the Lord Provost's declaration, when they are informed, that the Organ was used in St. Andrew's church, in the public worship of God, the very next day after he had received that letter. Indeed, it appears from Dr. Ritchie's own account, that he did not lay that letter before his musical committee till the 26th.

last, to the application of the minister and various members of the congregation of St. Andrew's church, for permission to introduce an Organ, it was not expected that you or any of the members of that congregation would have placed an Organ in that church, or would have authorized performance on such a musical instrument on Sunday, and at the time of divine service, without having previously obtained the sanction of our ecclesiastical legislature for such a proceeding.

That an Organ has lately been introduced into St. Andrew's church, and was used on Sunday last, while the congregation were engaged in divine service, I have received information from different quarters; and I have not yet learned that the ecclesiastical branch of our constitution has, in any shape, approved or sanctioned so material an innovation in our external form of worship.

Whether such an innovation be an improvement, or the reverse, it is not the province of the magistrates and council to inquire, or to determine. And I conceive I shall discharge the legal duty incumbent on the civil magistrate, in a religious or ecclesiastical point of view, by merely giving intimation of the event to the Rev. Presbytery within whose bounds this city is situated.

But while the magistrates and council thus leave entirely to the ecclesiastical judicatories, whose province it is to take cognizance of such matters, the superintendence and regulation of our external form of worship, I think it necessary on the part of the patrons of St. Andrew's church, and of the heritors of the parish, as notified in my letter of Saturday, thus formally to protest, and intimate to you as minister, and through your medium to the other members of your kirk-

session, and to the individuals of whom the congregation is composed, that, in the event of the measure which you have thought fit to adopt, without the approbation of the patrons and heritors, proving detrimental in any respect to the pecuniary interests of the city and community of Glasgow, the patrons and heritors hold you and the other members of your kirk-session and congregation as legally liable for the consequences, whatever they may be.

Farther, on the part of the magistrates of this city, I feel myself called upon to give you this formal intimation, that although determined as in duty bound, at all times to preserve peace and good order among the inhabitants, the magistrates hold you and the other members of the kirk-session, and congregation of St. Andrew's church, as responsible for the consequences of any breach of the peace which may possibly be occasioned by the innovation you have attempted to introduce.—I am, &c.

(Signed)

JAMES MACKENZIE.

To the Rev. Dr. RITCHIE.

Second Letter to the Presbytery.

REV. SIR,

Glasgow, 2d September, 1807.

Since my letter of the 26th ult. was transmitted to you, I think it right to inform you that a deputation from the St. Andrew's congregation waited upon me on Saturday last,* and intimated verbally, that they had come to the determination of

* The 29th of August.

giving up the use of an Organ for the present, if I would withdraw the communication which I had made to the Presbytery. To this intimation I gave no immediate answer, but having occasion to hold a meeting of the magistrates and council yesterday, on other business, I laid before them the whole of my correspondence about the Organ; they unanimously approved of all that I had done, and agreed that the matter should now rest with the reverend Presbytery.—I have the honour to be,

Rev. Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed)

JAMES MACKENZIE,
Lord Provost.

The Rev. Moderator of the Presbytery of Glasgow.

Minutes of Presbytery.

September 2d, 1807.

The Presbytery unanimously appoint the moderator to write a respectful letter of thanks to the Lord Provost, acknowledging his communication, and informing him, that the same is recorded, and that the Presbytery will take the case referred to, into their serious consideration. Dr. Ritchie requested the Presbytery to delay procedure in this cause till next ordinary meeting, solemnly promising, that the Organ should not again be used, without the authority of the church. The Presbytery unanimously granted said request.

October 7th, 1807.

Mr. Burns, the moderator of last meeting, *pro tempore*, reported, that he wrote a letter of thanks to the Lord Provost of Glasgow, agreeably to the Presbytery's appointment.

The Presbytery having resumed consideration of the cause respecting the introduction of the Organ into St. Andrew's church—Dr. Ritchie was heard on the subject, and judicially declared, in terms of last minute, viz. That he would not again use an Organ in the public worship of God, without the authority of the church.

The Presbytery having deliberated on this cause at great length, and maturely considered the same, a motion was made and seconded, viz. That the Presbytery are of opinion, that the use of Organs in the public worship of God is contrary to the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of our established church, and therefore prohibit it in all the churches and chapels within their bounds: And with respect to Dr. Ritchie's conduct in this matter, they are satisfied with his declaration.

On the other hand, it was moved and seconded, That in consequence of Dr. Ritchie's judicial declaration, the Presbytery should find it unnecessary to proceed further in this business, declaring, at the same time, their judgment, that the introduction of an Organ into public worship is inexpedient, and unauthorised in our church.

The state of the vote being first or second motion, and Dr. Ritchie having desired it to be marked that he declined voting—The roll was called, and the votes marked, when it carried, First motion,——Wherefore, the Presbytery did,

and hereby do, in terms of the first motion, declare that the use of Organs in the public worship of God is contrary to the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of our established church; and therefore the Presbytery did, and hereby do, prohibit the use of Organs in all the churches and chapels within their bounds: And with respect to Dr. Ritchie's conduct in this matter, they are satisfied with his declaration.

From which judgment, Principal Taylor, in his own name, and in the name of all those who should adhere to him, dissented, and promised to give in his reasons in due time, to which dissent adhered Dr. Ranken and Dr. M'Gill, Mr. Davidson and Mr. Jack, and took instruments in the clerk's hands.

November 4th, 1807.

The clerk reported, that there was lodged with him, in due time, reasons of dissent against the judgment of the Presbytery at last meeting, which reasons were read. The tenor wherof follows:

Glasgow, 13th October, 1807.

REASONS OF DISSENT from a Judgment of the Presbytery of Glasgow, October 7th, 1807, in which they declare, "That the use of Organs
"in the public worship of God is contrary to
"the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of the established church," &c. &c.

1. Because this sentence gives a decision upon a general question which was not properly under the consideration of the Presbytery. The question was not respecting the competency of the

Church of Scotland to judge in the case of instrumental music, nor even respecting the general point of its lawfulness and utility, but regarded an individual case brought before them, which was attended with peculiar circumstances, and to which the decision should have been confined. Positive decisions, on general questions, concerning which the church has not given an opinion, the dissenters conceive should be seldom attempted by an inferior court; but still less, when such general questions are not directly or necessarily brought under their consideration.

2. There were peculiar reasons in this case, which should have rendered the Presbytery satisfied with giving their judgment on it alone. The circumstances of the case, as brought before the Presbytery, were of a peculiar nature, and formed sufficient ground for a determination on its own merits. Any member could not be supposed to have formed a positive judgment on the general question, concerning which he knew not that he was to give an opinion, and the general purposes of peace and order would have been sufficiently and better secured, by *agreeing* to *receive* the *judicial declaration* of the *Minister concerned*, that the Organ should not be again used without the authority of the church, and finding, as the *Presbytery* would *unanimously* have done, that its introduction was inexpedient and unauthorised.

3. But these reasons would not have induced the dissentients to have entered their dissent, nor even perhaps to have divided the Presbytery on the subject, could they have acquiesced in the *justice* and *truth* of the declaration which the Presbytery have emitted. They are very far

from meaning to impute blame to their brethren, for whom they have the greatest respect and affection, they mean merely to express that difference of opinion which they feel themselves obliged to entertain upon the subject. They observe, therefore, as their last and principal reason of dissent, That the opinion expressed by the Presbytery, not only proceeds farther than the case required, but asserts as facts, concerning the law of the land, and the constitution of the church, what the dissenters cannot perceive, and dare not, consistently with a *good conscience*, affirm. No law of the church, nor of the land, has been passed concerning instrumental music; and they know of no law existing, to which they can go the length of pronouncing that it is *contrary*. The dissentients allow, that it is unauthorised, and they do not assert that authority for it should be given; but neither, on the other hand, can they assert that any law has yet determined the question. The question concerning the lawfulness, utility, or expediency of instrumental music in public worship, is open for the Church of Scotland to consider and determine. This being their opinion, they could still less proceed the length of declaring that it is contrary to the law of the land, and the very constitution of the church; and, by consequence, that it is not in the power of the Church of Scotland, even if willing, to take the subject under their consideration. The question, the dissentients consider to be a question of utility and expedience, which the church has it in its power at any time to consider and determine; nor do they know any law of the land, or principle of the constitution, which should prevent the church from giving any determination it shall,

in its wisdom, judge right. The Act of Security, the dissentients conceive, has been interpreted by the Presbytery with a *strictness* in this instance, which has never been applied to other subjects. And though they readily admit that the Barrier Act points out the mode, which, in the case of new practices and laws, must be followed, yet they conceive that the very design of the act, in pointing out the mode which is to be pursued, plainly shows that the church has the power of deciding upon new propositions or overtures, which interfere not with those general and leading principles on which its constitution is founded.

(Signed) WILLIAM TAYLOR.
ALEXANDER RANKEN.
DAVID DAVIDSON.
STEVENSON MACGILL.

Dr. Porteous, Dr. Balfour, Mr. Lapslie, and Mr. M'Lean, are appointed a committee to answer said Reasons of Dissent.

December 2d, 1807.

The committee appointed to draw up answers to the Reasons of Dissent against the judgment of the Presbytery on the 7th of October last, respecting the Organ, gave in said answers, which were read.—The Presbytery approve of said answers, and appoint the same to be recorded. The tenor whereof follows. Reserving it to Dr. Ritchie, Dr. Taylor, jun. and Dr. Lockhart, to submit to the next Presbytery such explanations as they shall think proper.

The committee appointed to prepare answers to Reasons of Dissent from a judgment of the Presbytery of Glasgow, 7th October, 1807, in which they declare, "That the use of Organs
 " in the public worship of God, is contrary to
 " the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of the established church," &c. &c. beg leave to submit the following to the reverend Presbytery.

The committee enter on this business with deep concern. But when reasons of dissent are *recorded*, an appeal is made to posterity, which renders the recording of *answers* indispensably necessary. Unfortunately, in these reasons, the Presbytery is not only charged with having acted *improperly*, but with having violated *truth* and *justice*. To repel so serious charges, it seems unavoidable for the Presbytery to furnish posterity with an account of their situation, and of the various extraordinary circumstances in which they are called to act. Should this give rise to strictures which seem severe, the responsibility must rest with those who have *recorded* reasons of dissent, and made it necessary for the Presbytery to vindicate themselves, as well as to defend the purity and uniformity of the national worship.

It is considerably more than two years since the public mind was agitated by the proposal of introducing an Organ into St. Andrew's church. During this long period, the Presbytery waited with patience, in the hope, that time and good sense would dispose the authors and abettors of this proposal, to listen to wiser counsels.

About the end of August last, a communica-

tion was made to the Presbytery by the Lord Provost, with the approbation of the city council, containing extracts, letters, and copies of letters, which, having been read by the Presbytery, they ordered a respectful letter of thanks to be written by the moderator, and sent to the Lord Provost, acknowledging the receipt of these papers.

From this communication, it appeared that an Organ had been introduced into St. Andrew's church, and employed on the Sabbath, in time of divine service. St. Andrew's church belongs to the National Establishment, and is under the jurisdiction of the Presbytery of Glasgow. It was certainly known, that Organs have never been used in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland,—and that no minister of that church had ever presumed, before this, to introduce them. It was certainly known that the people of Scotland are not given to change—especially in matters connected with religion. And it might have been known, that Glasgow is not the place, and the present is not the time, for a business of this sort.

Without consulting the Presbytery, or seeming to think they had any concern in the matter, some persons, describing themselves as the congregation of St. Andrew's church, sent a petition to the honourable magistrates and city council, containing a proposal to have an Organ introduced under their patronage, or with their consent and approbation.

This petition was accompanied by a letter, no less extraordinary than the petition itself.

Before the city council gave any deliverance, they consulted their legal assessor, who gave

them a written opinion, which does him much honour. This opinion the council adopted, and accordingly refused "to sanction, authorize, or approve in any capacity, directly or indirectly, expressly or tacitly," the introduction of an Organ into St. Andrew's church.

The applicants were certainly of opinion that the city council had some right, or power, which they wished to be exercised in favour of an Organ: and yet the refusal of their request did not hinder an Organ from being introduced into St. Andrew's church. It may therefore be doubted, whether greater respect has been shown to the Presbytery in not consulting them at all, or to the city council, in setting at nought their opinion, after having asked and obtained it.

Some time afterwards, the Lord Provost received information that an Organ was to be employed in St. Andrew's church, on the Sabbath, being the day immediately following, in time of divine service. It is easy to conceive his feelings as a chief magistrate, when the highest authority in the city, and the respectability of those in power, was thus treated; and that too in the sight of the astonished citizens, who have been taught, and are accustomed, to reverence and honour magistrates.

Under these feelings, he wrote the letter of the 22d August last. Of the same date, he received an answer, very decent and proper in itself; but, when it is connected with the operations of the following day, we are at a loss what to think of it. The fact is, however, that an Organ was, on the following day, employed in St. Andrew's church, in time of divine service.

A measure of this kind could not fail to strike

the minds of the people. They saw the constituted authorities of the city trampled upon—the order of the church deranged—the peace of the city disturbed—contention and its ordinary companions let loose, and they could perceive no motive for all this, but such as they are unwilling to describe.

The immediate consequences of this explosion, were, the communication of the whole transactions by the Lord Provost to the Presbytery, and the unanimous approbation of the Lord Provost's conduct, in a recorded act of the city council.

[Sept. 2d, 1807.] In this state, the business came before the Presbytery; and let posterity judge, whether the Presbytery have not all along treated their brother, who was chiefly concerned, with greater respect and tenderness than they have received from the dissentients.

It was first proposed to delay considering, and even recording any part of the communication, till the next ordinary meeting of Presbytery. This proposal was frustrated by Dr. Ritchie's demanding extracts; and saying, in a short speech, that he considered it as *his right* and *duty* to do what he had done. It was impossible for the Presbytery any longer to delay recording the communication from the Lord Provost. But they did delay all further proceedings, except ordering the letter of thanks; and it ought to be remembered, that Dr. Ritchie either dictated or approved every clause in the sentence pronounced by the Presbytery of this date.

An interval of a month was thus afforded for preparing such explanations, with respect both to the magistrates and the church, as would have

enabled the Presbytery to send a suitable and decisive answer to the Lord Provost's letters.

[Oct. 7th, 1807.] The Presbytery met, and were disappointed in all their expectations. Dr. Ritchie said nothing more than he had said at the former meeting, namely, That he would not again use an Organ without the authority of the church. The Presbytery unquestionably showed not a little indulgence, in declaring themselves so far satisfied with this, as to decline proceeding on the individual case. But they could not leave the business in this ambiguous form, without forfeiting their claim to firmness and integrity, and without exposing the city and the country to constant agitation and apprehension.

A solemn deliberation having therefore become necessary, it was now resolved on,—it was not objected to,—or if objections were hinted at, they were either not insisted on, or overruled by the Presbytery. And though no particular mode of conducting the discussion was laid down, yet, not a single member uttered a syllable, disrespectful or unkind towards his brother.

Could it be inconsistent with *justice*, or *truth*, or *propriety*, to consider the *lawfulness* of employing an Organ in the public worship of this national established church? If it was lawful, then there was no transgression. If unlawful, then too the business was likely to be settled without proceeding much farther. For the unanimous desire of the Presbytery manifestly was, to avoid, as long as possible, every stricture on the circumstance of the case which could lead to personalities, and to treat the minister and congregation of St. Andrew's church with all possible lenity.

We shall long remember two arguments which were employed in the course of this deliberation, and which we apprehend it is consistent with *justice, truth, and propriety*, to consider in this place.

1st. That God hath implanted in man a taste for music, which ought to be cultivated by introducing Organs into our churches, where, as well as in camps, great and good effects might be expected from it.

If this argument be applicable at all to the business in hand, it amounts to this,—that every principle, taste, faculty or propensity, implanted in man by the goodness of God, ought to be exercised in the house of God, on a Christian Sabbath, in a Christian assembly, and in Christian worship. An argument of this kind needs no refutation, to any who know what is forbidden in the second commandment.

But as something like it is employed by those who call themselves the congregation of St. Andrew's, a short illustration of its fallacy may be requisite. The Corinthians were charged by the apostle Paul with a gross profanation of the Lord's Supper. To this they might have replied, that God, in his great goodness, had implanted in every one of them, a taste and propensity to eat and to drink plentifully, and given them all the faculties necessary for doing so; which, therefore, it was their duty to cultivate and exercise in the house of God, and at the Lord's table. They might have added, that there was no law of the church, nor of the state, against doing what they had done,—that they encroached on no sacred privilege,—on no civil right of any man. In a word, they might have anticipated

almost every sentiment, and even expression, in the petition of this congregation. But they did no such thing: they repented of what they had done.

2d. A second argument, which was urged with much earnestness in favour of Organs, was built on something said, written or done, by the psalmist David, and on something recorded in the book of Revelations.

If this be almost the first instance of a Christian pleading divine authority for the use of Organs in religious worship, the singularity may excite some suspicion that the argument is not well founded.

Had the primitive church considered Organs as a part of instituted worship, they would, no doubt, have used them, or recommended them, or regretted the want of them. After the establishment of Christianity, and its consequent prosperity, no reason can be given why they were not used, if they were sanctioned by the prophet David, and the apostle John. But, no less than eight hundred years had elapsed, after the commencement of the Christian era, before Organs were resorted to; and even then, they were not defended by an appeal to Scripture, but by asserting a power in the church to appoint a ritual for divine service. This power was, in a great measure, denied by the reformers, who endeavoured to restore the primitive simplicity of Christian worship. We learn from Stewart, in his *History of the Reformation*, that in our land, their endeavours were crowned with signal success. Page 200, he says, "That the Protestants in Scotland, when they accomplished the Reformation in the year 1560, departed in a wide

“ extremity from the splendour and pomp of the
 “ Romish forms and ceremonies, disdaining to
 “ flatter the senses and imagination; and confi-
 “ dent and secure that the native purity and
 “ brightness of their doctrines, were fully suf-
 “ ficient to uphold them. All exterior greatness,
 “ the allurements of magnificence, the charm of
 “ painting, and *the enchantment of music*, were
 “ disregarded, not *only as mean and useless arti-*
 “ *fices*, but as *dangerous trappings*, which might
 “ *obscure and degrade the interests and dignity of*
 “ *truth*. They sought to revive the plainness and
 “ sincerity of primitive times.”

It may be added, that if the practices of an Old Testament prophet are understood to be recommended under the New Testament, then all the particulars of his usage must have the same authority, dancing, or piping, among the rest. Nothing, however, can be more manifest, than that all Christian divines, with the apostle Paul at their head, have believed, that the Old Testament worship was altered so as to suit New Testament times, and that they had authority from the Lord Jesus Christ to teach this doctrine. Nor can it be doubted, that such alteration did take place in the present instance, with more precision than in any other particular; for *singing* is the only instituted mode of performing this part of religious worship, and was exclusively employed for that purpose, upwards of eight hundred years.

We shall now proceed to a more particular review of the reasons on which the dissentients, after mature reflection and research, have chosen to rest their dissent. These reasons are, certainly,

both in respect of matter and manner, liable to severe criticism, and easy refutation.

1st. The first reason of dissent might be answered, merely by copying it, leaving out the particle *not* in every negation, and discreetly replacing it in almost every affirmation. The result would be very nearly a true statement, but the mode of producing it not sufficiently dignified for the Presbytery, nor respectful to the dissentients.

We therefore refer them to their own motion, for an answer to their first reason. This motion decides the general question, with no less precision than the Presbytery's sentence, and the contradiction which it gives to this reason of dissent, is so striking, that it needs only to be pointed out. In the motion, they declare it as their judgment, that the introduction "of an Organ into public worship is inexpedient and unauthorised in our church." And in the first reason of dissent, they blame the Presbytery for deciding the general point of its lawfulness and utility. Now, it must be evident to every ordinary understanding, that the motion decides the *general point*, as positively as the sentence of the Presbytery.

Another fact the dissentients ought not to have overlooked, that there was no individual case before the Presbytery: no parties were called, and no persons were considered, or considered themselves, as parties. The name of the minister principally concerned having been unintentionally passed over in calling the roll, was, at the very desire of one of the dissentients, called in the vote, which shows that he did not then consider him as a party.

The simple truth is, that this was a delibera-

tion which might have led to the calling of parties, had not the Presbytery, regardless of all provocation, and more indulgent to others than they have experienced from them in return, kept steadily to their original intention, of treating all who were implicated in this business with the utmost delicacy; at the same time performing their duty to the church and to the public with firmness and decision.

2d. The second reason of dissent is so multifarious that it cannot legitimately be reduced to any common head. Part of it is evidently a repetition of what the dissentients had stated in their first reason of dissent, respecting the individual case, and has been answered already. The dissentients then complain that they were taken by surprise, and could “not be supposed to have formed a positive judgment on the general question; nay, that they knew not they were to give an opinion” concerning it.

This is certainly not a little wonderful. Had not more than two years elapsed since the attention of this city and neighbourhood was directed to this subject, and must have met them almost in every company? Had not the communication from the Lord Provost been more than a month on the table of the Presbytery? Was it not known, that at this meeting of Presbytery that communication was to be taken under consideration?

But it seems they had formed a positive opinion on two points, much more difficult than this: the *inexpediency of introducing Organs*, and *that the use of them is unauthorised in our church*;—an accurate knowledge of *men, times, and places*, and a distinct review of *all* the acts of Assembly, was indispensably necessary to warrant such an opi-

nion. And how, in the nature of things, could a positive judgment on these particular points be formed, without coming to a similar judgment on the general question, which is evidently less intricate, and attended with less difficulty; which the Catechisms, and Confession of this church, and our other solemn engagements at ordination, are of themselves sufficient to ascertain?

The term, *unauthorised*, may have been selected with some dexterity; and the dissentients seem to regret that it was not adopted by the Presbytery. But if it was intended as an insinuation that our church had heretofore never interposed her authority in opposition to Organs, and a preparation for asking and obtaining her authority in favour of them, the adopting of such an insidious term would, we apprehend, have been a mean and unbecoming sacrifice of truth, an unmanly dereliction of principle, and a flagrant violation of that admirable ecclesiastical constitution, and of those invaluable civil rights, which were purchased by our ancestors, at the expense of their talents, their treasure, and their blood. It would have enervated the Presbytery's sentence, and rendered it utterly insufficient for the purposes of *peace* and *order*, which have been accomplished and secured by it, as it now stands.

3d. The third reason of dissent contains a profession of the greatest respect and affection from the dissentients towards their brethren. We cheerfully acknowledge and return the compliment.

As this is the last and principal reason of dissent, without which we are informed there would have been no dissent, nor even, perhaps, a division of the Presbytery on the subject, we lament that there is so little lucid order, or logical pre-

cision in it. But we presume, the argument it contains may be comprehended in the two following propositions.

1st. That there is nothing in the constitution, or laws, of the church or state, inconsistent with, opposite, or contrary to the use of Organs in religious worship.

2d. That Organs may now, or hereafter, be introduced, by the authority of the church of Scotland.

Both these propositions we consider as quite unfounded and untenable, and are not a little surprised that any Scotch Presbyterian should venture to assert them.

The constitution of our church may be easily deduced from her principles and usages. Her great and leading principles are contained in the Scriptures, as these are explained in our acknowledged standards; and from these we derive evidence, little short of demonstration, subversive of these propositions.

We might have hesitated to produce some part of this evidence to the learned dissentients, but as a very respectable congregation are implicated in this business, there may be no impropriety in giving them an opportunity of being reminded of some things which they were taught in their youth.

The second commandment is surely a law of this church, for it is a law of God: And the church in her authoritative commentary, says, in the Shorter Catechism, "The second commandment requireth the keeping *pure* and entire all such religious worship and ordinances as God hath appointed in his word." Query, Is that religious worship kept pure, according to God's

appointment, which is blended and mixed with human inventions, at least 700 years later than the death of the last of the apostles?—"The second commandment *forbiddeth* the worshipping of God by images, or any other way not appointed in his word." Query, Was *this way* of Organs appointed in his word?—In the Larger Catechism, the second commandment requireth as in the Shorter, and particularly sanctions *thanksgiving*; but it farther requireth, "*disapproving, detesting, opposing, all false worship,*" and, according to each one's place and calling, "*removing it.*" Query, Is not all worship false, which is not instituted and appointed?—The sins *forbidden* in the second commandment are "all devising, counselling, commanding, using, and any wise approving, any religious worship not instituted by God himself." It likewise *forbids* "corrupting the worship of God, *adding to it,* or taking from it, whether *invented* and taken up of ourselves, or received *by tradition* from others, though under the title of *antiquity, custom, devotion, or any other pretence* whatsoever," &c.

These passages contain the great and leading principles of our ecclesiastical constitution, respecting the worship of God. And the Confession of Faith is equally explicit on this point. "The acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and *so limited* by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the *imaginations* and *devices of men.*"

That Organs were an abomination to our venerable ancestors, who assisted in composing these ecclesiastical standards, or sanctioned them

with their most solemn approbation, is an historical fact, established by the most unexceptionable authorities. Thus, Baillie, vol. 1, let. 43, page 421, dated 18th February, 1644, and addressed to Scotland, says, "We had so contrived
 " it with my Lord Wharton, that the lords that
 " day did petition the Assembly that they might
 " have one of the Divines to attend their House
 " for a week, as it came about, to pray to God
 " for them. Some days thereafter the Lower
 " House petitioned for the same. Both their desires were gladly granted: for by this means
 " the relicks of the Service-book, which till then
 " was every day used in both Houses, are at last
 " banished. Paul's and Westminster are purged
 " of their images, *Organs*, and all which gave
 " offence. My Lord Manchester made two fair
 " bonfires of *such trinkets* at Cambridge."—All the commissioners at London, in their letter to the General Assembly, dated 20th May, 1644, thus express themselves, "We cannot but admire
 " the good hand of God in the great things done
 " here already, particularly that the Covenant
 " (the foundation of the whole work) is taken;
 " prelacy and the whole train thereof extirpated;
 " the Service-book in many places forsaken;
 " plain and powerful preaching set up; many
 " colleges in Cambridge provided with such ministers as are most zealous of the best reformation, altars removed, the communion in some
 " places given at the table with sitting; *the great*
 " *Organs* at Paul's and Peter's, Westminster,
 " taken down; images, and many other monuments of idolatry, defaced and abolished; the
 " Chapel Royal at Whitehall purged and reformed; and all by authority, in a quiet man-

“ner, at *noon-day*.” Nay, the General Assembly, 1644, in their answer to the Right Rev. the Assembly of Divines in the Kirk of England, not only adopt the sentiments of their commissioners at London, but express them, if possible, with greater energy, force, and triumph. “We were greatly refreshed to hear by letters from our commissioners there with you, and by a more particular relation from the Lord Waristown, now with us, of your praiseworthy proceedings, and of the great good things the Lord hath wrought among you and for you: Shall it seem a small thing in our eyes that the Covenant (the foundation of the whole work) is taken: That antichristian prelacy, with all the train thereof, is extirpate: That the door of a right entry unto faithful shepherds is opened: Many corruptions, as altars, images, and other monuments of idolatry and superstition, removed, defaced, and abolished; the Service-book in many places forsaken, and plain and powerful preaching set up; the *great Organs at Paul’s and Peter’s taken down*; that the Royal Chapel is purged and reformed; sacraments sincerely administrate, and according to the pattern on the mount.”

The great and leading principles of our ecclesiastical constitution have been subscribed and avowed by every minister of the Presbytery, before God and men, in the most solemn manner, as articles of their faith. Whatever, then, they may be to others, they must be a law to them. It is for the dissentients to judge whether this third reason of dissent be compatible with this law, and consistent with *truth* and *justice*.

About the time of the Union with England,

there were some apprehensions of danger to the uniformity of our national worship. Our church had hitherto rested with confidence on her Catechisms and ratified Confession, but now thought that something more might be done. Accordingly, in 1707, the Assembly passed the Act against Innovations in the worship of God. "It discharges the practice of all innovations in divine worship within this church, and requires and obtests all the ministers of this church, especially those in whose bounds such innovations are, or may happen to be, to represent to their people the evil thereof, and seriously to exhort them to beware of them, and to deal with such as practise them, in order to their recovery and reformation." So much convinced were this Assembly, that the removing and suppressing of innovations was vested in the executive power by the ratification of the Confession, and the various acts of security, that they authorize application to be made to government for that purpose.

It did not occur to this Assembly that any thing more was necessary, nor, perhaps, that any thing more could be done. But in 1711, it was enacted, that every minister, before his ordination, do acknowledge the obligation of this act against innovation; promising in the most public and solemn manner, in the house of God, in presence of the Presbytery and an assembled congregation, "firmly and constantly to adhere to, and to the utmost of his power, assert, maintain, and defend the purity of worship, as presently practised in this national church, and asserted in the fifteenth act of Assembly, 1707," which is the act above recited.

Thus the uniformity of our worship was taken out of the hands of lawyers and metaphysicians, and brought home to the conscience, the honour, and the honesty of every individual minister of our church.

It is surely impossible that any of the dissentients will again affirm, that no law of the church has yet determined the question concerning Organs or instrumental music in our public worship, when it appears with so much evidence to be inconsistent, not only with our ecclesiastical laws, but with the great, leading, and fundamental principles of our constitution.

This reasoning needs no confirmation, but it may receive much illustration from the prevailing sentiments, opinions, and customs of our country.

No religious sentiment is more powerful and universal among the people of Scotland, than an attachment to that simple, spiritual, and unornamented worship, which is described in our standards—which was practised under the sword of persecution—reverenced by our fathers, adhered to from principles of patriotism, as well as religion, and retained as the fruit of victory, and the pledge of liberty. This attachment to simple worship, is so strong, and so universal, that all the dissenters from this church, numerous and respectable as they are, have never deviated from her forms of worship. In the west of Scotland particularly, this attachment, and the habits connected with it, are so predominant, and have so long continued, as to form a consuetudinary law, independent of all others, to which the dissentients and the Presbytery are bound to conform.

But the people of Scotland do not defend the

purity and uniformity of their national worship merely upon ecclesiastical grounds—they claim these, and the *tranquillity which attends them*, as their birth-right—as a portion of their political liberty, to which they have the highest *legal*, as well as *just* and equitable title—a title which, they are well assured, will be made effectual by the executive power, vested in all the king's courts and judges. To prefer this claim is the privilege of every Scotsman since the year 1688, or at least since the Union of the two kingdoms; and, of course, if any of *their countrymen* should be found making an attack on this purity and uniformity of worship, the Presbytery of Glasgow will not applaud either their wisdom or their patriotism.

As the dissentients do not seem very clearly to understand these things, it may not be improper to explain them.

Our ancestors, immediately after the Revolution, were, undoubtedly, very solicitous to have their religion and their religious worship secured from change and innovation. This security they obtained by the parliamentary ratification of the Confession of Faith; which was generally believed at that time to make the Confession a part of the law of the land, and consequently to invest the king's judges with full authority to give it execution. Many are still of this opinion. But before the year 1700, some persons seem to have thought that the term *ratification*, and other terms employed in that act, were not sufficient to convey the right of enforcing execution to the civil magistrate.

To remove every doubt on this important subject, it was resolved to proceed with the Con-

fession of Faith, as they had done with respect to the Claim of Rights, which is not law, but a quarry out of which many of our most valuable laws have been taken.

In order to embody certain articles of the Confession with the laws of the country, and thus secure the execution of them without any controversy, the Acts of Security were passed in the years 1700, 1702, and 1703. These acts, however, relate chiefly to the doctrine and government of the church. No particular mention is made of *the worship* till the year 1705, when an act was passed for *a treaty with England*, the last clause of which is in these words, "Providing also, that the said commissioners shall not treat of or concerning any *alteration* of the *worship*, discipline and government of the church of this kingdom, as now by law established."

This is almost the first time that the Scotch Parliament distinguished the *worship* from the doctrine, government and discipline of this church. Now, that a union with England was projected, these wise men foresaw increasing danger to the *worship* of this church, and were determined to provide against it.

With this view, the Act of Security, 1707, was framed and enacted. Indeed, this seems to have been the principal intention of this act; for no new clause is introduced, except what relates to the purity and uniformity of our worship. Without this, any of the former acts might have answered the purpose almost as well as this one. Since, however, the necessity of securing our *worship* had been suggested, the Parliament of Scotland were resolved that this should be done with precision, with authorities, and with so-

lemnities unknown in any other transactions between independent states.

It was enacted in Scotland, and declared to be a fundamental condition of the Union: It was ratified by the *English Parliament*, and engrossed verbatim in the Treaty of Union.

Henceforth, there can be no doubt that Scotch uniformity of worship is secured as fully as it can be by human laws: for the execution of this, as well as every other law, is committed to the king, who, at his coronation, must swear and subscribe that he shall “inviolably maintain and preserve” the foresaid settlement of the true Protestant “religion, with the government, *worship*, discipline, rights and privileges of this church, as above established by the laws of this kingdom, in prosecution of the Claim of Rights.”—And from the king, the execution of this, still more than any other law, must pass to the king’s courts and judges; to the Judge Ordinary of the place in the first instance, and in due course to the House of Lords.

This very important, solemn and extraordinary law, has enacted, that the *forms* and purity of our worship *shall be unalterable*—that they shall *be continued* to the people of this land *to all succeeding generations*, as they were practised in 1707: and further, “that this act shall be held” and observed, in all time coming, as a *fundamental* and *essential* condition of any treaty or union to be concluded betwixt the two kingdoms, without any *alteration* thereof, or *derogation thereto, in any sort, for ever.*”

As to the strictness with which these acts should be interpreted, we need not descend to altercation with the dissentients. Enemies being

judges, they cannot be interpreted more strictly than their fair construction and primary intention will justify.

This we advance on the authority of a contemporary historian, and celebrated prelate of the Church of England, who records the passing of these acts with manifest regret. Burnet, ‘*Hist. of his Own Times*,’ vol. 2, page 212, speaks thus of the act, 1703, “By this, all the hopes of
 “the Episcopal party were lost, and every thing
 “relating to the church did not only continue in
 “the same state in which it was during the former reign, but the Presbyterians got a new law
 “in their favour, which gave them as firm a settlement, and as full a security, as *law could give*;
 “for an act passed, not only confirming the
 “Claim of Rights, upon which the crown had
 “been offered to the late king—one of its articles being against prelacy, and for a parity in
 “the church—but it was declared high treason
 “to *endeavour any alteration* of it. It had often
 “been proposed to the late king to pass this into
 “an act; but he would never consent to it. He
 “said he had taken the crown on the terms in
 “that claim, and that therefore he would never
 “make a breach in any part of it: but he would
 “not bind his successors, by making it a perpetual law.”—And page 276, he says of the act, 1707, as follows:—“An act was prepared
 “for securing the Presbyterian government, by
 “which it was declared to be the only government of that church, *unalterable in all succeeding times*, and the maintaining it was declared
 “to be a fundamental and essential article and
 “condition of the Union: and this act was to
 “be made a part of the act for the Union;

“ and in consequence of that, was to be ratified
 “ by another Act of Parliament in England.
 “ Thus, those who were the greatest enemies to
 “ presbytery of any in the nation, raised the cla-
 “ mour of the danger that form of government
 “ would be in, if the Union went on, to such a
 “ height, that, by their means, *this act was carried*
 “ *as far as human law could go for their security;*
 “ for by this, they had *not only all the security*
 “ *that their own Parliament could give them;* but
 “ they were to have *the faith and authority of the*
 “ *Parliament of England;* it being, in the stipu-
 “ lation, made an essential condition of the Union:
 “ The carrying this matter so far, was done in
 “ hopes that the Parliament of England would
 “ never be brought to pass it. This act was
 “ passed, and it gave an entire satisfaction to
 “ *those who were disposed to receive any;* but no-
 “ thing could satisfy men who made use of this
 “ only to inflame others.”—Hence, according to
 Burnet, the Act of Security is to the British
 Parliament what the Barrier Act is to the Ge-
 neral Assembly, a *safeguard*, an *absolute veto*,
 against the reviving of ANTIQUATED GENERAL
 QUESTIONS, or the agitating of new ones, with
 regard to the doctrine, worship, discipline and
 government of our national church. The bishop
 has recorded, a century ago, the *justice and truth*
 of the declaration which the Presbytery have
 emitted on the 7th October last, but in which
 the dissentients cannot, with a good conscience,
 acquiesce.

Were a spirit of this innovating and vacillating
 kind to invade our church, we tremble for the
 consequences. Neither the Barrier Act, nor the
 Act of Security, would be able to prevent her

from beginning a retrograde course, till her glory was sunk, and utterly lost, in the darkness of the 12th century. Then, as we learn from Mosheim, vol. 2, page 438, “The rites and ceremonies
 “used in divine worship were greatly augmented
 “among the Greeks, *and the same superstitious*
 “*passion for the introduction of new observances,*
 “discovered itself in all the Eastern churches.
 “The Grecian, Nestorian and Jacobite pontiffs,
 “that were any way *remarkable for their credit,*
 “*or ambition,* were desirous of transmitting their
 “names to posterity, by the *invention of some*
 “*new rite, or by some striking change,* introduced
 “into the method of worship that had hitherto
 “prevailed.—Thus, some attempted, though in
 “vain, to render their names immortal, by intro-
 “ducing a new method of reading or reciting
 “the prayers of the church; *others changed the*
 “*church music,* others again tortured their in-
 “ventions to find out some new mark of vene-
 “ration that might be offered to the relics and
 “images of the saints; while several ecclesiastics
 “did not disdain to employ their time with the
 “most serious assiduity, in embellishing the gar-
 “ments of the clergy; and in forming the motions
 “and postures they were to observe, and the looks
 “they were to assume, in the celebration of di-
 “vine worship.”

To avert so direful a calamity from our church and our country—to crush in the bud so scandalous a prostitution of sacred things,* the magistrates and city council, and the Presbytery of

* This approbation of Mosheim's description is expressed in strong language; nevertheless, it is just; and it is to Mosheim's description this language refers.

Glasgow, have, in this instance, done their duty with integrity and honour; and in whatever light the dissentients may view the *deed*, we have pleasure in declaring, and that in perfect consistency with a good conscience, that it has the most unqualified approbation of our understanding and our heart.

We are happy to find it admitted by the dissentients, in the close of their reasons, that there are certain *general* and *leading* principles, upon which our constitution is founded, which the church has not power to alter. None of her judicatories has power to suppress the Christian or Protestant religion—to change one article of the Confession of Faith—to substitute prelacy or independency in the room of presbytery;—in a word, to authorize *any* practice, or to enact *any* law, that is inconsistent with, or contrary to, the laws of the land, especially the most sacred of all her laws, namely, the Treaty of Union, and the acts on which that treaty is founded: Consequently, no ecclesiastical court in Scotland has power to alter the forms of our worship, or to deprive succeeding generations of that purity and uniformity of religious worship, which has been the glory of our land for more than a century.

(Signed)

WILLIAM PORTEOUS.

ROBERT BALFOUR.

JAMES LAPSLIE.

JAMES M'LEAN.

Glasgow, 1st December, 1807.

Minute of Presbytery, January 6th, 1808.

Dr. Ritchie, Dr. Taylor, jun. and Dr. Lockhart, severally gave in papers in consequence of the reservation in the Presbytery's last minutes in the question respecting the Organ, which papers being read, the Presbytery order the same to be recorded, *simpliciter*. The tenor follows:

Rev. Dr. Wm. Taylor's Jun. Explanation.

It is with reluctance that I make use of the liberty which the Rev. Presbytery has allowed me, of giving in an explanation of my reasons why the Presbytery should not have adopted, without correction, the answers that their committee prepared to the Reasons of Dissent, in the cause of the Organ, read at their meeting in November. I was out of the country when this business commenced; I was astonished, beyond measure, when I heard of it, by accident, 400 miles hence; and when a final sentence was given at a succeeding Presbytery, I had the honour of presiding in the court. And thus, from the commencement to the close, had no opportunity of taking part, either on one side or the other, in this singular business. I am sensible, therefore, of a great aversion to stir it at this period. I feel strongly a delicacy which forbids me to seem to interfere; I bow to the sentence of the Presbytery, as in duty bound, which now can neither be altered or appealed from; and I bear a high respect towards the members of the committee, who prepared the answers, which the Presbytery has,

in full, adopted. But I am impelled by what I owe to myself, and the duty I owe to the Presbytery, to make this appearance, however reluctantly. For I cannot allow, that, by my silence, it should be understood, that I sanctioned a paper, in which it appears to me, that there are many things altogether improper, and which, in my opinion, the Presbytery, careful of their own fame and credit, should have rigorously examined, and in many particulars amended.

There is a license taken in the general frame of the paper alluded to, that is altogether indefensible. It professes to be Answers to Reasons of Dissent that were formerly given in; and the committee who framed it, were appointed for the express purpose of answering these reasons. But not confining themselves to the reasons put into their hands by the reverend Presbytery, they go into a wide field of historical detail, no way necessary; they set about recollecting and answering the arguments that were used, *viva voce*, in the presbyterial discussion by different members, and that had no place in the writing they were to answer; and enlarge in this manner on the general argument. This was manifestly leaving the business that was entrusted to them by the reverend Presbytery, and doing what was altogether illicit, and unusual in such cases.

In these answers, I perceive also, with much regret, a mode of speaking often used, which might well have been spared, in a paper that the reverend Presbytery was to adopt as theirs; in which there is heat and passion; and which, heard by the ignorant and prejudiced, is, in various instances, too liable to unhappy misconstruction. A heathen could say, that it became

men who were to deliberate about difficult matters, to be free from passion. And, surely, the language which the Presbytery adopts, should be calm, and grave, and moderate; and it would be unpardonable, either to give, as an example to the present generation, or to hand down to posterity, what is, in any measure, of a contrary character. In the historical detail of the origin and progress of this business, language of this heated and exaggerated kind is sufficiently obvious. The manner in which the congregation of St. Andrew's is mentioned in this paper, is surely in too lofty a style—"Some persons, describing themselves as the congregation of St. Andrew's church." This is the expression. We should speak of those, who, in the constitution of our court were absent, with respect; and knowing the existing circumstances, language should have been avoided, that had any tendency to convey the idea that there were pretensions on the part of those spoken of, that were not well founded.

Allusion is made in the paper adopted by the Presbytery, to the word "unauthorised," as applied to the Organ, in the Reasons of Dissent. In a case, hypothetically stated in the answers to these reasons, this is said to be an "insidious" term. It is not in this way that the reverend Presbytery has been in use to speak of the discussions of its members. Every man is understood to act *bona fide*, conscientiously, and with fairness: And I have no doubt that this will amply apply to the reasonings that have passed on both sides, in this very singular question. I forbear adverting to any expressions which I might think alluded improperly to a respectable mem-

ber, chiefly concerned in this business, as he is sufficiently able to defend himself.

There is a passage in the Answers, which the reverend Presbytery should surely have hesitated in adopting as theirs.—“ Had the primitive church considered Organs as a part of instituted worship, they would, no doubt, have used them, or recommended them, or regretted the want of them. After the establishment of Christianity, and its consequent prosperity, no reason can be given, why they were not used, if they were sanctioned by the prophet David, and the apostle John. But no less than eight hundred years had elapsed, after the commencement of the Christian era, before Organs were resorted to.” It is said, “ Had the primitive church considered Organs as a part of instituted worship, they would no doubt have used them.” But how was it possible to use what was not then invented!—the primitive church taking in the three first, or four first centuries, and the Organ was not invented till the eighth century. How then could the church use them, or recommend them in the primitive times, or in the prosperous times of Constantine, when the idea of an Organ was not then formed! How could they regret the want of them, since, “ *Ignoti nulla cupide!*” It is obvious, that this portion of the reasoning in the Answers is built upon a gross *anachronism*.*—The committee who pre-

* This charge of ANACHRONISM is unsupported, either by argument or authority. Organs are generally allowed to be the discovery of remote antiquity. The quotations given afterwards from Justin Martyr, Basil, and Chrysostom, show, that musical instruments had this name at the time these Fathers flourished.—Indeed, the mere *existence* of musical instruments,

pared the Answers, have searched, with considerable labour, into the records of church and state, but it is very obvious, from what has been produced, that they have not gone deep enough. They have shown, with much conviction, the presbyterian church must differ from episcopacy;—that it is averse to the hierarchy of bishops—to liturgy, and read prayers, and that it has a discipline of its own. But, in the present question, it was absolutely necessary to show, that our church went still farther than all this, and that it limited and defined the particulars of worship; because Organs do not belong exclusively to the Episcopal Church, but are used in the Church of Geneva, from whence, as a church, we are sprung; and in Holland, who resemble us in our constitution and worship. The committee, in my opinion, should have, if I may use the expression, stood up closer to the argument. The Presbytery, by their sentence, built high; and it was the business of the committee to dig deep. I should beg the Presbytery's excuse, for taking up their time so long, on a matter that is now decided on.—The rigidly simple Spartans nailed Tarpan-der's harp to a post, because, by a daring innovation, he had added one string to it beyond what was common. The Organ, by a sentence of Presbytery not appealed from, is in the same se-

in the first seven centuries, whether *called* Organs or not, is all that the Presbytery's argument is concerned with. And the argument is still unanswered, and we believe, unanswerable, viz. If seven or eight centuries elapsed, before Organs or instruments of music were introduced into Christian worship; and if the want of them was, during all that period, never regretted by the church, it is a decisive proof, that the primitive Christians regarded them as *unlawful*, and *inconsistent* with the purity of evangelical praise.

cure position, and therefore there was no need to say any thing of it. All that I intended, was to show, that the reverend Presbytery should have carefully examined the Answers to the Reasons of Dissent, and made some corrections, before they adopted them as their own.

(Signed) WILLIAM TAYLOR, Junior.

Glasgow, January 5th, 1808.

Dr. Lockhart's Explanation.

Having received permission from the Rev. Presbytery to offer certain explanations on their Answers to Reasons of Dissent from the sentence of Presbytery, with regard to the use of the Organ in the public worship of God, I beg leave to offer the following, and request that they may be put on record.

1st. I must be explicitly understood as adhering to the Presbytery's sentence, and as approving of the answer of the dissentients, in-so far, as these answers are founded on the prevailing sentiments of our forefathers, on the act of the church against innovations in the worship of God, and on the Act of Security.

2d. It does not appear to me that the dissentients, in their third reason of dissent, have charged the Presbytery with any violation of truth and justice. I consider them as expressly denying that they had any such intention, and as merely asserting, that they could not, with their view of the subject, adopt the sentence of the Presbytery, without a criminal inattention, on their part, to the claims of truth and justice. I

must, therefore, hold them in respect, for acting under the influence of their own conviction, and give them full credit for the liberality of sentiment which they have expressed, by declaring that they have the greatest respect and affection for the brethren from whose judgment they dissent. It would, therefore, in my opinion, have been extremely desirable, that the Presbytery, in their answer, had declined employing the severe language to which they have resorted; and which, I apprehend, they would not have employed, had they fully weighed the explanation given by the dissentients.

3d. I must farther express my opinion, that the Answers on the part of the Presbytery, ought to have been conducted without any allusion to the observations of individual members of court, supposed to have been stated *viva voce*, at the time of discussion, but not stated nor even alluded to, in the reasons given by the dissentients. I likewise regret, that in the argument, as conducted by the Presbytery, they should have given any detailed statement, in relation to the particular case, which led to the discussion.

4th. Even on the supposition that I had approved of that part of the Answers, which seems to embrace matter foreign to the sentence of the Presbytery, and to the Reasons given in by the dissentients, I should have been disposed to deprecate the introduction of that passage, in which the illustration of the Presbytery's argument is taken from the case of the Corinthians, in their profanation of the Lord's Supper.

Lastly, While I admire the simplicity of the forms of worship observed in our national church, as peculiarly congenial to the spirit of Chris-

tianity, I am unwilling to acquiesce in any such application of the second commandment, as would charge with false worship, or with a violation of that part of the divine law, our Christian brethren of other churches, whose practice, in the instance to which the sentence of the Presbytery refers, is different from our own.

(Signed) JOHN LOCKHART.

The reader will, no doubt, do justice to the liberality and indulgence of the Rev. Presbytery, in allowing the preceding Explanations by the Rev. Dr. Taylor, junior, and Dr. Lockhart, to be recorded, as none of these gentlemen had judicially dissented or complained against the decision in question. And it is hoped, he will see the same spirit of liberality and indulgence, in thus publishing these explanations. Candour requires, that the public should be put in possession of every paper in this cause, whether favourable or unfavourable to the mode of procedure adopted by the Presbytery. Perhaps an opportunity may be taken, in the sequel, of making a few remarks on these explanations.

Statement of the grounds on which the MINISTER of ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH thinks himself vindicated in permitting, and of the facts connected with his employing, an Organ in public worship on the Lord's Day.

A wish had for years, for more than thirty years, been cherished by the congregation of St.

Andrew's church, to have an Organ erected, and employed in public worship. After the proposal for such an erection had been repeatedly made to me, by respectable members of the heads of families belonging to that congregation, I at last gave my assent, with the full approbation of my own mind. The principles upon which this my assent has been, and still is founded, I have now the honour to lay before the Presbytery. In doing this, I take no charge of the Reasons of Dissent from the sentence passed by the Presbytery against the use of Organs. These reasons, though not fully to my mind, are yet, in my opinion, valid as to the main point, which they are meant to establish. Neither do I enter the lists with the answers to these reasons, with many of the positions in which I perfectly agree, while yet, in many respects, my opinions are different from those of the respondents. But it becomes me, in vindication of my congregation and myself, to open up the grounds upon which we think we had the right to employ an Organ in public worship.

There is one, and but one, fixed and infallible standard for all that regards public worship. Whatever is not agreeable to, and founded upon the Word of God, ought to have no place in the worship of Christians. Now, in looking into our Scriptures, we find, that before the giving of the law, instrumental music was employed by the twelve tribes of Israel, to whom, through the fathers, the promises had been given. When we look into the history of nations that were strangers to divine revelation, there too we find universally, the use of instruments in giving praise to their gods. Such use, then, appears to be

something that belongs not to sects or parties, but to human nature. It is dictated by the best of those feelings which the God of nature hath implanted in every bosom, prompting men to employ with reverence, according to the means which they possess, all their powers in expressing gratitude to their Creator. It appears to be such from its existence prior to all positive religious establishments, and from the universal practice of mankind.

When we advance in our inquiry, and look into the covenant of peculiarity introduced by the ministry of Moses, no mention is made of instrumental music among the ritual observances of the law. In a system of merely temporary institution, it was not deemed necessary, by positive enactment, either to forbid or to enjoin the use of instrumental music in public worship. But it was left to the will, and situation, and circumstances of the worshippers. Yet, while the ritual law, in all its branches, forms a majestic whole, guarded by most solemn sanctions, instrumental music was not found to interfere with its rites, to break its unity, or to be inconsistent with the perfect pattern furnished on the mount. What was the practice of the church of Israel in this respect, from Moses to David, has not been recorded. David, of whom was to come, and of whom, according to the flesh, is come, Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, was raised from keeping his father's flock, to fill an eminent station, and to act an important part, in the great scheme of Providence. He was richly endowed with gifts and graces for maintaining and promoting, in the conspicuous station to which he was exalted, the pure worship of the true God.

Many are the prophecies that he uttered, as he was moved by the Holy Ghost; many are the sublime strains of praise which he poured forth by the Spirit; and in some of the most sublime of these strains, when wrapt up in the majesty of the King he adored, he invites, exhorts, enjoins, not merely the congregation then assembled, not merely the twelve tribes of Jacob, but all nations, all the earth, to praise the Lord as he did, with psaltery, and with harp, and with Organ, and with the voice of a psalm. Was his language and his conduct an infringement of the law of Moses, so awfully hedged in on every side by curses and by blessings? Was not he zealous for the law? Was he compelled by any superior authority to adopt a practice which he felt to be inconsistent with the purity of instituted worship? Was he not seated on the throne? Was he not the anointed of the Lord? Was he not animated by that pure Spirit, who alone kindles in the pious heart the flame of living praise? These Psalms of David have ever been held in such high estimation, not only by Jews but by Christians, that they have been adopted by all sects and parties; they have, by sovereign authority, been appointed to be sung by all national churches. They have been, and are appointed by the Church of Scotland, to be sung in congregations and in families. And can it be a sin to sing them as was done by the original composer, with the accompaniment of an Organ? If these strains ever flowed warm and pure from a human heart, we cannot deny that they must have done so from the heart that first conceived them, warmed by the sound of his harp and his Organ, under the immediate inspiration of the Holy

Ghost. Shall any church, shall a Protestant church, condemn the singing of the Psalms of David, as they were sung by the man according to God's own heart?

But it may be said, that the church was then in an infant state, and that now, become men, we should put away childish things. Let us then consider what we have to learn from the conduct of our Lord and his apostles. Now, we no where find the great Head of the church, the Lord Jesus Christ, repealing the injunctions pronounced by the psalmist David.—Jesus was continually going about, was often in the temple and in the synagogues, often was present at public worship, and the reading of the law. He often administered reproof to the Jews for their attention to minute rites, and the tradition of the Fathers, while they neglected “the weightier matters of judgment, mercy and faith.” He was zealous for the honour of the temple, his Father's house; he cast out the money-changers, and overturned their benches; but he never once opened his lips against their music and their Organs. Would Jesus have been silent on this subject, had instrumental music been a gross profanation of sacred things? Can we suspect him of winking, through weakness, at what he knew to be a corruption of worship? The apostle Paul, in his journeyings, frequented ever the synagogues. There he met and disputed with the Jews. Ardent was his zeal against the beggarly elements of rites and ceremonies. Many are the important practical rules of life that he has laid down; many are the exhortations to praise that he has given; and is it not strange, that, amidst all his warnings, he never warns his

Gentile converts against harps, and psalteries, and Organs? At Jerusalem, at Corinth, at Ephesus, at Athens, and at Rome, he must have often seen and heard instrumental music in worship, and yet not a single reproof of it has ever dropt from his pen. If ever a human being breathed the pure spirit of his Master, it was John, the beloved disciple. In his gospel, written towards the evening of his days, and in his epistles, we read not one sentence in condemnation of Organs. When we advance to the book of Revelation, that deeply mysterious book, which shuts up the vision and the prophecy, we find that John, now fifty years after the ascension of his Lord, while he himself was an exile in the isle of Patmos, when the forms of Christian worship must now have been at least as familiar to his mind, as ever had been the worship of the temple:—when we read this book, we find not one, but so frequent allusions made to instrumental music in worship, as lead us to infer on his part, high approbation of it. Nay, in one passage, he expressly declares, that he heard “harpers harping with their harps in heaven.” Words cannot be simpler, nor convey more plainly an unequivocal meaning: and that meaning clearly is, that instrumental music is at least not inconsistent with the purity of evangelical praise. And whatever value or meaning men may now attach to the imagery of that prophetic book, it certainly stood high in the estimation of the Westminster Divines. I adduce but one example. In support of that paragraph of the 23d chapter of our Confession of Faith, which asserts the right of Christian sovereigns to wage war, they give the fol-

lowing passage from the book of Revelation, as one of their authorities, chap. xvii. 14th and 16th verses, "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them, for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings; and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful. And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked; and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire." Now, if the bold imagery of this passage be—and what minister or presbytery of our church can deny it to be—a solid foundation on which to build so important a doctrine, as that of the right of kings to make war, then, surely, the simple language of the passage to which I refer, clearly establishes this truth, that instrumental music accords perfectly with the purest praise that we can conceive. For it is an eternal truth, that the Holy Spirit of God never did, and never could, suggest to the mind of David, or of John, or of any created being, an image or a sound that has the most distant tendency to promote impure thoughts, and to corrupt religious worship. Here, then, is one fundamental point established: the use of instrumental music in public worship is not in itself sinful, is not forbidden by the word of God, but, on the contrary, is expressly encouraged, perhaps enjoined, in the Old Testament, and is clearly authorized by the New.

Supported by this high authority, let us next trace what we have to learn on this subject from the history of the church. Was instrumental music employed in their worship by the Christians of the first age? There is every reason to believe that it was not. No mention is made of

it by the earliest historians,* and perhaps no mention would have been made, although it had been in general use; because such music in worship was neither striking nor strange, either to Gentiles or to Jews. That harps and Organs could not then be employed,† must be evident from the severe and unremitting persecution to which the church was subjected. How could men think of

* Be it so, that the "earliest historians do not mention instrumental music as employed by Christians of the first age;" it cannot thence be inferred that they were friendly to the employment of musical instruments in the worship of God. For, it will appear from the authorities produced by the Presbytery, that when the primitive Christians had occasion to mention instrumental music, they uniformly expressed marked disapprobation of it, and declared it inadmissible into Christian worship.

† Vague and general description of this kind has no meaning, and tends to mislead. A closer and more particular view will dispel the illusion. The infant Christian church could boast of converts from among the Levites, who had been singers, or musical performers in the temple. Barnabas, we know, from Acts iv. 36. was a Levite, an opulent man, of a cultivated and liberal mind. His generous spirit is celebrated by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles. "He sold his land, and laid the money at the apostles' feet." When Paul returned to Jerusalem, and "assayed to join himself to the disciples, but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple," Barnabas "took him, and brought him to the apostles?"—He was the first Christian at Jerusalem to befriend and patronize St. Paul; and, for a considerable time he was the intimate companion, and zealous fellow-labourer of that apostle. This Barnabas was, doubtless, skilled in the music of the temple, and both familiarized and attached to it, prior to his conversion. But he abandons his professional habits, his favourite employment as a Levite, the moment he becomes a Christian. Never does he practise or extol the services of his tribe or family, nor recommend these to be adopted by Christians in their public worship. To say, that Barnabas, who shared in the toils, and dangers, and persecutions of St. Paul, in Cyprus, his native country, in Pamphylia, in Pisidia, in Iconium, was frightened from using a psaltery or harp, lest the sound should betray him to his adversaries, is perfectly incredible, and utterly irreconcilable to common sense.

employing harps and Organs, while they were fleeing from city to city, and hiding themselves in holes, and dens, and caves of the earth? Even when, by the conversion of Constantine, a Christian emperor was seated on the throne of the Roman world, the peace of the church was far from being secured. Wars and revolutions, and inundations of barbarous nations, succeeded each other with a ferocity and rapidity, and to an extent, of which we, even in these eventful times, can form only a very inadequate conception. Mingled with these wars, and promoted by them, controversy arose after controversy, and sect after sect in multitudes, and directed the attention of mankind to matters of far more importance than sacred music. Modes of worship were forgotten, amidst the keen contention for modes of faith. Yet, even in defiance of the stern barbarism and fierce superstition of those ages, some attention was paid to psalmody; for we find that controversies on this subject, arose between church and church, and among the members of the same church. But, as might be expected, little progress was made by a people, whose throats were more accustomed to the hideous cry of war, than to the soft notes of praise. About the middle of the eighth century, an era of flattering promise seemed to begin. Something like order was introduced among the Western nations, and some faint gleams of light began to dawn, struck out by the vigorous administration of Charles Martel, of Pepin, of Charlemagne. While Pepin, in the year 757, was holding a council of his clergy at Compiègne, for the reformation of manners, there arrived an Organ, sent him in compliment to his high reputation, by that Constan-

time, emperor of the East, who is so famous as the iconoclast, the fierce enemy of images in churches, of convents, monks, and nuns. This Organ, the first, it is said, that had been seen in Europe, the French king presented to the church of St. Corneille, at Compiègne. Struck with the majesty of the instrument, and the solemnity of its sound, the heroic soul of Pepin thought he could not better employ it, than by devoting it to the service of his God. Charlemagne, son and successor to Pepin, continued the use of Organs, as we learn from a poet of the ninth century, who, describing the effects of that instrument in that age, says, that a woman was so transported with the music, that she fainted and expired under the sweetness of the sound. His words are,

Dulce melos tantum vanas illudere mentes
Cæperat, ut una, suis decedens sensibus, ipsam
Fæmina perdiderit, vocum dulcedine vitam.*

This instrument seems still to have been employed, and to have spread at least in fame, if not in numbers, during the reign of Louis the son of Charlemagne. For there exists a letter from the then Pope, John VIII. in which, towards the end of the ninth century, is this request to a German bishop, “Precamur autem, ut optimum organum, cum artifice qui hoc moderari et facere ad omnem modulationis efficaciam possit, ad instructionem musicæ disciplinæ aut deferas, aut mittas.” Such was the state of the arts even in Italy, during the ninth century, that not a man could be found

* Is this the kind of rapture that any Christian man or woman would wish to die in? Can it be a recommendation of Organs, that they produced so tragical an effect in the ninth century?

who could make, or tune, or play upon an organ. And the pope requests, as a singular favour, that a man who *could* do so, might be sent to him from Germany, for teaching the Italians music. From the death of Louis, and even during his reign, the prospect of dawning reformation in government, in science, and in religion, was darkened by a cloud that thickened ever deeper over Europe for more than two hundred years, during which we learn nothing of instrumental music in churches. At last, Europe was roused by the papal summons to the crusades. Thousands travelled for conquest to the Holy Land. This fanatical frenzy continued to drain Europe of its inhabitants for a couple of centuries. Though most of the crusaders fell in Asia, yet some were continually returning, and by their observations on what they had seen, contributed not a little to awaken the human mind from the lethargy into which it had been sunk. Then began the age of scholastic philosophy, and of scholastic theology, which exercising the human understanding on points of the nicest and most perplexing subtilty, paved the way for that bright day of sound literature, and pure religion, which now shines over Europe. At this era, so auspicious to the human race, it is worthy of remark, that we again find Organs beginning to appear, and walking side by side with the other improvements of the age. So far then, were Organs from being the invention of the darkest ages, that it was ever during periods of dawning light* that they began to be employ-

* Does the author imagine that the dark ages had not commenced when Pepin and Charlemagne flourished? The best

ed, not by the authority of a papal decree, but by the dictate of pious feeling, prompting the enlightened mind to consecrate the labours of genius to the devout exercise of praise. The dark ages had neither the head to invent, nor the hand to make, though they might have had the heart to enjoy them. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, great were the exertions of the human soul, struggling for knowledge, for liberty, for employment suited to its powers. The pressure of superstition and of papal oppression counteracted their own ends, and through the unseen workings of a gracious Providence, were overruled to bring on the Reformation. Organs did not shrink from the scrutinizing zeal of that keenly-searching age; for Luther and Calvin, and the other enlightened reformers,* discovered in them nothing of the idolatry of a corrupted church, which they so nobly laboured to overturn. And, indeed, upon the slightest attention

historians, civil and ecclesiastical, are of a different opinion. By them, the dark ages are considered as comprising the seventh, and continuing till the twelfth century. There might be various shades in the darkness of these centuries, but the state of literature, philosophy and theology, during the whole of that dismal period, establishes the melancholy truth, that superstition reigned triumphant over the minds of men. It is of no importance to the argument, whether this degrading superstition was in the hands of the Greek or Roman church; whether it was aided by the skill of a German or Italian artist, whether it was managed by the influence of a monk, of an emperor, or a pope. No man of any observation, or research, will deny, that pious feeling may sometimes animate the heart of the ignorant and superstitious. Indeed, unenlightened pious feeling, hath, too often, both engendered and fostered superstition.

* Whether this be a fair and accurate account of the opinions of the reformers, will appear from the quotations produced by the Presbytery, from the works of the reformers, and in their own words.

by the most superficial inquirer, it must be discovered, that instrumental music forms no essential part of popery; that it is founded upon principles widely different, indeed, from the ceremonies of the Church of Rome, because it is consonant at once to sound reason, and the word of God. Accordingly, it was retained, and it is still employed, by all the reformed churches on the continent of Europe. A stronger argument in its favour cannot be produced, except that which I have already mentioned, the sacred authority of Scripture.—Why then has it not been employed by the Church of Scotland? The reasons are strong, as they were pressing; and in tracing them, we shall discover the origin of that prejudice which still remains against Organs. Whatever our psalmody might have been under the popish power, we know, that in the reforming Church of Scotland, it must have been almost annihilated. Religious truth had to work its way amidst poverty and oppression, in opposition to the power of an arbitrary government, and to the persecuting spirit of the Church of Rome. There were neither houses for the celebration of religious ordinances, nor ministers to preside in the celebration of them, nor funds for the support of ministers. No wonder, that in these circumstances, every thing was laid aside, but the pure preaching of the Gospel, and the performance of worship in the best manner, which the necessity of the times would allow. From this state of degradation, it was long before our church was able to emerge. The doctrines of the Reformation, it is true, were generally embraced; and a system of ecclesiastical policy, settled agreeable to the general wishes of the country. But

the wealth of the church had been seized by the landed proprietors, and long and arduous was the contest, before even liberty of conscience, and presbyterian government, could be fixed upon a permanent foundation. The causes of this contest are easily ascertained, and its effects are deeply felt, even in our own day. The troubles unavoidable from the factious spirit of a feudal nobility, under a female popish reign; the bigoted partiality of a pedantic king for prelatie splendour, which he deemed favourable to absolute monarchy; the mistaken piety of a virtuous sovereign, contending, by unhallowed means, for what he thought agreeable to the word of God; the hypocritical ambition of a bold usurper, wading through the dark fanaticism of his cotemporaries, to the possession of a kingdom which he affected to decline; the unprincipled treason of a lawful prince, restored to the throne of his ancestors, straining by force and fraud to impose upon our country a yoke which its brave inhabitants were determined never to bear; the weak infatuation of a popish sovereign, urging him on not merely to the destruction of presbytery, but of the Reformation;—this unbroken series of persecution, maintained with such unrelenting obstinacy, through such a number of years, impressed, engraved, wrought into the very soul of our presbyterians a fear, a dread, an abhorrence, not only of popery and prelacy, but of every thing that had been connected with popish and episcopal worship. Under these circumstances, our forefathers thought, and felt, and contended honourably, nobly, as became patriots and Christians. What Scottish heart does not sympathize with them, asserting, at the expense of fortune

and of life, those high privileges which we now enjoy! What mind but must approve of a conduct dictated by manly feeling, by religious principle, by the love of all that they held sacred on earth and in heaven! Under the irritation to which they were subjected, they acted wisely, when, in obedience to that strong impulse of what they owed to moral, political, religious existence, they wrecked, as they did, their vengeance on altars, crosses, Organs, on every the most distant seeming appendage, of a form of worship which they were determined not to embrace. And if an infatuated government should attempt, in any future age, a similar mode of infringing the sacred rights of man, it is to be hoped, that the spirit of our ancestors would revive in their descendants, and animate them to contend, as their fathers did, even to the death, for liberty of conscience, and for pure religion.

It is then evident, that from the Reformation down through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was not possible for our church to pay much, if any attention to sacred music.* A new era commenced at the Revolution; from which period downwards, our Presbyterian Establishment has, under a limited monarchy, enjoyed all the peace and protection which government can bestow. During a century of uninterrupted prosperity, it is to be expected that legal independence, and perfect security against the

* The printed acts of the Scotch Parliament, and irrefragable historical record, furnish the most direct and positive evidence, that this averment has been made precipitately, and without sufficient information: a blunder, which is less pardonable, when we consider the tone and manner in which the author sometimes speaks of others.

encroachments of popery or prelacy, may have disposed churchmen and laymen among us, to consider calmly what is, and what is not essential to those forms of ecclesiastical government, and to rise superior to the weakness of rejecting improvements in things indifferent, merely because they are employed by churches whose modes of worship we reject. This, in a very considerable degree, has taken place. National and religious antipathies are yielding to the lenient hand of time. A liberality of spirit pervades our enlightened church. Improvements even in our psalmody are begun, which prognosticate favourably for farther advancement. The tide of human affairs is strong. The hand of God, guiding the progress of mind, cannot be resisted. The steps will be made, which yet remain, for vindicating our church and our country from the reproach of neglecting one of the best means, that has ever been devised, for the improvement of sacred music. And shall Organs, it will be asked, shall Organs be introduced into any of our churches in Scotland? And why not? Have not we, the disciples of Calvin,* as good a right to instrumental music in our worship, and all its advantages, as his disciples in Geneva, in Switzerland, and in Germany? But has not our church been always hostile to Organs? Of such hostility no evidence exists, or can exist, in a case similar to the introduction of the Organ into St. An-

* Though we are not the disciples of Calvin, and will not call *any man* master; yet our respect for his opinion is increased, by considering the grounds of it: and *Calvin's opinion* is *decidedly against* instrumental music being used in the public worship of God, as is shown afterwards from the express authority of that great reformer.

drew's church. For this is a singular case; the first attempt of the kind, that was ever made according to the pure principles of presbytery. The people of that congregation, respectable both from character and from number, and steady, as any of their countrymen, in their attachment to the religion transmitted to them by their fathers,—the people made the proposal, not dictated to them by a domineering priest, not imposed upon them by a tyrannical government, but as their own unbiassed wish, cherished among them for years, before they ever knew the man who is their present minister. The Organ was introduced upon principles as free from any connexion with episcopacy and popery, as the principles of our Directory for Worship are, from connexion with the Church of England and of Rome. Against such an introduction, our church could not possibly enact laws, or discover a hostile spirit, because it had never hitherto taken place. Laws are a remedy provided against past or present evils. The sagacity of legislators cannot pierce into futurity, and provide against what may arise in the course of ages. But, did not an Assembly of our church, in the year 1644, re-echo to the Scotch divines at Westminster their expressions of triumph over the destruction of the great Organ at St. Paul's? Yes; but these were times of fierce and furious war against the Church of England. An invading army, who have no antipathy to hedges, and villages, and corn fields, yet while they are advancing to battle, may level cruelly with the ground every obstacle that impedes their progress to victory. The enemies which our divines of that age had chiefly at heart to subdue, was not the helpless, harmless

Organ, but the hierarchy and Service-book of our sister kingdom. And from their success in destroying what they regarded as the *outworks*, they might with joy anticipate their reducing to subjection the last resort of the adversary. Antipathy to Organs in this country, has ever been associated with antipathy to Episcopacy. Organs and prelates have, by a surprising want of discrimination, been involved in one common condemnation. But what have Organs to do with bishops? Nothing more than with John Calvin, John Knox, or Mr. Andrew Melville; they are never once mentioned in the Book of Common Prayer. The canons of the Church of England never touch them.* Instrumental music in worship is not the property of any one particular church or kingdom. It is the hereditary right of every church and country under *heaven*. But has not our church an act of security incorporated with the Act of the Union of the two kingdoms; and acts of the General Assembly against innovation, which completely guard us against the introduction of Organs? The Acts of Security, of Union, and against Innovation, had more important objects in view, with which Organs have no concern. By the Revolution, the Act of Security, and the Act of Union, these have been secured to us, to our church, and to our country; all *that* for which our fathers fought, and for which so many shed their blood. The purity and uniformity of the doctrine, and discipline, and government, and worship of the Church of Scotland, are to be preserved to the people of Scotland, without alteration, to all succeeding gene-

* The reasons of this will be afterwards assigned.

rations. This is the firm foundation on which we stand, and shall stand, as long as human laws, and human power, and British liberty can support us. From this foundation it is my hope, and it shall be, through God, my endeavour, that no power of earth or hell, shall be able to move us. Here we are guarded by high and strong bulwarks against every hierarchy, whether of Popery or Episcopacy. On this ground, no liturgy, or service-book, can, or dare invade us. We are an established church, fenced round by all that can render us independent and free. Our purity and uniformity in doctrine, we declare by our subscription of our Confession of Faith. Our attachment to the discipline and government of the church, we attest by our subscription of one formula. Our purity and uniformity of worship we prove by our adherence to the rules laid down in our Directory. To each, and to all of these, I trust, I have uniformly adhered, as faithfully as my neighbours. I am not conscious of a wish having ever arisen within me, to depart from any of them. And in the use of an Organ in our church, during public praise, I cannot, for my life, after long and serious attention to the subject, discover even an approach to any violation, either of the purity or uniformity of our worship. For who will, or can allege, that an Organ is an innovation upon the great Object of worship?—we all, I trust, worship the one God, through the one Mediator: Or upon the subject of praise? for we all sing the same psalms and paraphrases, in the same language, all giving thanks for the same mercies: Or upon the posture of the worshippers? for we all sit, as becomes true Presbyterians: Or upon the tunes sung? for we sing

only such as are in general use; or upon the office of the precentor, for he still holds his rank, and employs the commanding tones of the Organ for guiding the voices of the people. What then is it? It is a help, a support given to the precentor's voice, for enabling him more steadily, and with more dignity, to guide the voice of the congregation; and thus to preserve, not only uniformity, but that unity of voice which is so becoming in the public service, which so pleasingly heightens devout feelings, and prevents that discord, which so easily distracts the attention of the worshippers. And shall the addition of a certain quantity of modulated sound to the precentor's voice, in perfect union with his, and therefore incapable of disturbing the current of devotion, shall this be magnified into the monstrous crime—the presumption of worshipping God by images—of violating the Articles of the Union—of demolishing the barriers for the security of our religion—of committing *a deed* of perjury* to or-

* We are not a little astonished at this very unguarded language of the reverend author. The word *perjury*, as applied to *him*, never escaped the lips of a single member of Presbytery, during the whole of that long and spirited debate which took place on the 7th October last: Even the dissentients, though differing from their brethren in opinion, spoke in terms of the highest approbation, of the handsome and delicate manner in which the debate had been conducted. Indeed, the readiness with which the Presbytery received Dr. Ritchie's declaration, that he would not again use an Organ, without the authority of the church, as narrated in their minutes, must convince every one, that they would never have granted such indulgence to a man whom they had called *perjured*. They expressed, then, in the course of the debate, what they have recorded in their answers to the dissentients, "The great and leading principles of our ecclesiastical constitution, have been subscribed and avowed by every minister of the Presbytery, before God and man, in the most solemn manner, as articles of their faith.

dination vows? Such insinuations against the people and the minister of St. Andrew's church, I can express by no other terms, than that they are a total perversion of the meaning of words, utterly confounding the nature of things. But as all congregations will not, or cannot employ Organs, therefore the national uniformity is broken. Does our national uniformity consist in nothing more substantial, than a certain fixed quantity of sound, beyond which no congregation has authority to pass? What is the subject to which this uniformity relates? There can be no *mode* without a subject to which it adheres. And shall our national uniformity be said merely to relate to things unsubstantial, ever varying, ever vanishing, even while the ear is labouring to hear, and the mind to catch them? To attach perpetuity of form to things, from their nature incapable of uniform duration, would be a solemn

“Whatever they may be to *others*, they must be a law to *them*.” They quoted the questions put to ministers at their ordination: 1st, Will you practise and maintain the purity of worship, as *presently practised* in this national church, and asserted in the Act against Innovations? 2dly, Do you promise to submit yourself *quietly and meekly* to the admonition of the brethren of this Presbytery; that you will follow no divisive courses from the *established worship* and doctrine of this church? And they quoted also the FORMULA, which every minister subscribes, in which he owns “the *purity of the worship* presently authorized and practised in this church, and that he will constantly *adhere* to the same, and that he will neither *directly nor indirectly*, endeavour the prejudice and subversion thereof.” All this was urged in a general question, relative to instrumental music. Dr. Ritchie was not a party in that question, and not more *particularized* than any other minister of the Church of Scotland. Why, then, does Dr. Ritchie insinuate, that any of the brethren called him *perjured*? Why do his anonymous advocates presume, in the spirit of *falsehood* and *defamation*, to publish to the world, that Dr. Porteous and Mr. Lapslie “*wantonly* charged Dr. Ritchie with the awful crime of perjury.”

mockery of our venerable legislators. Have all congregations, or can all congregations, have an equal number of voices, the same heighth, or depth, or force of sound, for expressing themselves in praise? All congregations have not bands of singers to guide them in praise. But do these things, the result of situations and of circumstances, which no human law can prevent, break in upon the national uniformity of worship?—No more than the difference between a plain untutored country congregation, where almost every man and every woman sing honestly their own tune, and the well-regulated harmony of a Glasgow kirk, guided by a highly cultivated band. And there is not an abuse of which Organs are susceptible, nor an objection to which they are liable, nor an improper influence which they may be supposed likely to produce, which may not, in an equal degree, be ascribed to a band of human singers, which is literally an Organ, composed of the throats of moral agents, converting themselves for hire into pipes and whistles. But it is not against these petty distinctions, which are unavoidable in every large society, when French equality* is not the order of the day; it is not against these that the wisdom of our church and state have so anxiously guarded us, but against the hierarchy and the Service-book. From inattention to this, combined with the distracted

* We are at a loss to know what is meant to be insinuated by the phrase, "French equality." The author must certainly be sensible, that Presbyterian parity, and the uniformity of the public worship of God, established by civil and ecclesiastical statutes, and sanctioned by immemorial usage in this kingdom, are not to be *disparaged* or *ridiculed* by a despicable cant expression, dictated by the revolutionary mania of French infidels.

state of the country in former times, has arisen the prejudice against Organs ; while the mistaken idea has been cherished, that they form a component part of Episcopacy. That this is mistake and prejudice, is proved beyond all possibility of doubt, by the conduct of the most purely Calvinistic, and most strictly Presbyterian churches on the continent. Not free, I am disposed to presume, from the influence of this mistake, the respondents seem never to have inquired what was done in St. Andrew's church. They conjure up to themselves some horrid prostitution of sacred things, and then fight against it, as, *pro aris et focis*, wielding their arms against a shadow. What took place in our church is literally this. The precentor, as usual, was in his place. The Organ joined him, and so did the congregation. The Organ never struck a note but at the same moment with the precentor, it proceeded along with him, pausing from line to line, in the ordinary method, maintaining throughout the whole, that grave melody which our Directory enjoins; and with him it ceased. Who can discover here the monstrous profanation of worshipping God by images? Another mistake, which, in my apprehension, runs through the opinion maintained by the respondents, is, that we, the minister and congregation of St. Andrew's church, were assuming to ourselves the sovereign prerogative of enacting a law for the whole church, for obtruding Organs upon all the congregations in Scotland. This surely is a gigantic idea; such a thought never arose in our minds. We exercised what we believed to be our sacred private right, and we will ever allow to others the free exercise of theirs. Acting under

the influence of these, which I regard as mistaken apprehensions of the subject, the respondents have contended strongly against Episcopacy, which I have never undertaken to defend. They have passed a sentence, which in my apprehension, goes far beyond the object which they meant to condemn. For that cannot be illegal, against which no law exists, or *could exist*. That cannot violate, which touches not the constitution. That cannot be against the law of God, which is authorized by his Word. That cannot be against the spirit and the genius of our church, which she habitually recommends to the people, by her appointment of the singing of David's Psalms. Before declaring her prohibition of Organs, it is incumbent on the church to expunge from the sacred records those passages which seem clearly to recommend the use of instruments in worship; that thus the worshippers may be delivered from the inconsistency of promising, and exhorting each other to do, what in their hearts they resolve, and by the church are forbidden to perform.

Such being the principles and sentiments which I had long entertained with regard to instrumental music, I felt myself fully warranted to concur with my people, in their scheme of erecting an Organ in St. Andrew's church. With this view, application was, in autumn, 1806, made to the Lord Provost, magistrates, and council, *not for leave to erect* an Organ in the church. It became us, not to present a request, which the civil power had not the right to grant. All matters of worship belong exclusively to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The request was, that the Lord Provost, and magistrates, and council, as our heri-

tors, would allow certain alterations in certain seats, that there might be room for setting up an Organ. The petitioners, at the same time, binding themselves to defray the expense, and to make good all damages that might be *supposed*, but which they *apprehended* not to arise from the introduction of the Organ. This request, the magistrates, upon principles which to them seemed just, thought proper to refuse. The petitioners submitted, as became them, to the civil power, and never presumed to think of touching the seats in question. In this situation the business lay, until in the beginning of June last, it was resolved, by the minister and a few heads of families, to have a meeting one evening in the week, of such members of the congregation as might find it convenient to attend in church, for the purpose of improving themselves in sacred music. This practice, I believe, existed in other churches of this city, and the idea was borrowed from our neighbours. After finding that this proposal was relished by a number of the hearers, and that they gave regular attendance, it was next proposed by some of the attendants, to introduce a Chamber Organ, as a help to the precentor, for guiding the voices of the singers. For such an introduction, it never once occurred to us, that leave should be obtained from either the civil or ecclesiastical power. This was a matter of merely private accommodation. We did not meddle with the seats;—we made no alterations whatever, on any part of the church. The Organ was introduced, was employed regularly one evening in the week, and the use of it never did, as far as I know, excite even the appearance of a tendency to disturbance. We walked to and from church in

peace and quietness. Nobody minded *us*; they were better employed in attending to their own affairs. While we were thus meeting together, as members of one family, it was suggested, that our edification might be promoted, and our improvement surely not retarded, by concluding our meeting with family worship. This was done; and in praise we employed the Organ. The people present were highly gratified, and became loud and urgent in their requests for the use of that instrument in public worship. The resolution to employ it was adopted. But before our resolution was put in practice, I received from the Lord Provost of Glasgow, the official letter of the 22d of August, which is now in the Presbytery record. This letter had not the effect of making me shrink one moment from what I believe to be my right, from the privilege of directing all that concerns public worship in the parish church of which I am minister, independently of the civil power. I did not betray the cause of the church, in yielding up to the civil magistrate, what can only fall under the jurisdiction of my ecclesiastical superiors. I maintained the privileges of this court, and I am now in my proper place, accounting for my conduct to the Presbytery of which I am a member. The Organ was employed in St. Andrew's church, in public worship, on the 23d of August last. No explosion took place. No damage ensued. All was done decently, and in order. According to my promise, in my answer to the Lord Provost, I embraced the first opportunity of laying his lordship's letter before a number of the gentlemen, who have commonly acted with me in this matter. They all with one voice

agreed, that his lordship's terms were fair, were just, were what they expected; and nothing more than what, upon a former occasion, in conversation with the magistrates of the former year, they had engaged to perform. Three gentlemen were named for waiting upon the Lord Provost, and giving him the assurance which he required. Here, surely, there was no mark of disrespect to the civil power. This our meeting was on the 26th of August; and on that day I received the Lord Provost's second letter, conveying the official information, in full form, that he had taken the legal protest against us, which we never doubted would take place; and giving notice that he was to lay the whole matter before the Presbytery. Wishing, as from the beginning I had done, that every thing might be avoided that might have the most distant appearance of an interference between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and fully persuaded, that information not only might, but certainly would be lodged in some other way; for how could a deed be concealed, done in a parish church, in the face of a congregation, during public worship on the Lord's Day? With this wish, and under this persuasion, I sent two gentlemen twice in one day, to request of the Lord Provost that the civil power might no more be seen in this business, because whatever opinion the Presbytery might form of the cause, they might, perhaps, be jealous* of an encroachment on the rights of a mi-

* It would have been desirable that the author of the Statement had, in this request to the Lord Provost, been a little more delicate in bringing forward the reverend Presbytery to the view of the public. He seems to have been all along peculiarly attentive to their *ease* and *conveniency*, for never so

nister, since to them belongs, exclusively, the judgment in such cases, and the privilege of calling in the civil power in aid of their judgment, against refractory and obstinate ministers. On this principle, I acted from the most sincere respect for both branches of the constitution. The information was lodged; and when the Presbytery was about to enter on its discussion, I, not knowing in what light the civil power was to be regarded, craved a delay, which the Presbytery obligingly granted. At next meeting the business received so very unexpected a direction, and was hurried on by such a storm of zeal, that I have no desire now to reagitate the subject. The result stands upon record. And it is my hope, that what I have now submitted, shall also be committed to record, that thus both sides of the question may be subjected to the review of future generations. And whatever opinion men may form of the merits of either side, I trust, that every insinuation against the loyalty to magistrates and to the church, of us who are advocates for an Organ, will be found groundless. We, the minister, and elders, and congregation of St. Andrew's church, are loyal citizens. We honour and we obey our magistrates. We vie with our fellow-citizens in our exertions to maintain the civil power in that dignified respectability which the interests of good order in Glasgow require. We are steady in our attachment to our ecclesiastical establishment, as transmitted to us by our

much as once did he consult them in this affair of the Organ, but kept all his plans and operations concerning it a profound secret from them. Why then does he now expose the Presbytery, by holding them up as a bugbear to hinder the civil magistrate from doing his bounden duty.

fathers, and secured to us by the law of the land. In what we have done, on the subject of an Organ, we have had ever in view our own edification, without even the imagination of doing injury to an individual, of being disloyal either to church or state. We have acted as a united people; not a voice from among us having been raised against those who have stood most forward in the business.* The subscribers to the petition, had the concurrence and the good wishes of the whole people for success in their scheme. The example is singular, of a minister, and elders, and people, uniting as one man, for promoting their own improvement in sacred music, by means which they deemed fair, and legal, and honourable, while yet, by those to whom they were looking up for encouragement, they have been exhibited to the world, as violating the law both of the church and of the state. Feeling, as we do, the harshness of the sentence pronounced against us, we have confidence that the judgment of a candid public will be, that guilt has been imputed, where there was no crime, and that we have become the victims of a prejudice which we wished to remove,—the prejudice, that instrumental music in public worship is inseparably connected with Popery, and with Prelacy. In combining my efforts for this end, with those of my congregation, I have made no sacrifice of judgment, or even of opinion; for I have acted

* We have never heard that there was a meeting either of the session or congregation at large, to approve or disapprove of the measures adopted by their musical committee. Of course, the congregation never had it in their power to give their voice in a formal constitutional manner, either for, or against those, who stood most forward in the business.

from the full approbation of my own mind, confirmed by the judgment and the practice of men of the most cultivated understandings, and of the purest hearts, that have ever adorned the reformed churches. And though, on this occasion, no sacrifice has been required of me, for complying with the wishes of my hearers, yet I am persuaded they will consider what is past, as a pledge on my part, that, if future circumstances should require it, in whatever can contribute to their liberal enjoyment, as well as to their religious improvement, no sacrifice shall be refused by me to my people, to whom my labours and my life are devoted.

(Signed)

WILL. RITCHIE.

Glasgow, 6th January, 1808.

Minutes of Presbytery.

February 3d, 1808.

On reading the minutes of last meeting, the Presbytery appoint Dr. Porteous, Dr. Balfour, Mr. Lapslie, and Mr. M'Lean, a committee to prepare an answer to the paper given in by Dr. Ritchie at last meeting. Dr. Porteous to be convener.

March 30th, 1808.

The committee appointed to draw up answers to the Statement of Dr. Ritchie, gave in said answers, which being read and approved of, without a vote, were ordered to be recorded; which Mr. Lapslie and Mr. M'Lean were ordered to see done.

Answers by the Committee for the Presbytery of Glasgow, to Dr. Ritchie's Statement.

Your committee, in obedience to the appointment of the reverend Presbytery of Glasgow, beg leave to submit the following answer to a paper given in to the Presbytery, by the Rev. Dr. Ritchie, on the sixth day of January last, entitled, "Statement of the grounds on which the minister of St. Andrew's church thinks himself vindicated in permitting, and the facts connected with his employing an Organ in public worship, on the Lord's day."

Your committee beg leave to preface their answer with the following request : That it may be explicitly understood by all parties, as a fixed principle, that in this discussion between our brother and us, we are to avoid all general speculation about what might, or might not be, a proper form of religious worship, to be adopted by an infant church, met for the first time, to model its establishment. For the minister of St. Andrew's church and his congregation, and we, your committee, either in the character of teachers, or in the capacity of hearers, are defined constituent parts of the established Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and each of us have pledged ourselves to defend its doctrine, government, discipline, and worship, as contained and specified in its standards, and confirmed by the public law of the land.

If that paper, which we are appointed to answer, had been written by a man entirely unacquainted with our sacred records, and only dictated by those feelings, which, as the statement expresseth itself, "the God of nature hath im-

“planted in every bosom, abstract from all positive religious establishments:” or, had it been written by a professed episcopalian, inclined by education, and influenced by habit, to prefer the pomp of cathedral worship, to the simplicity of the primitive times of the church of Christ: or, had it even been written by a congregationalist, who conceives that the will of his particular flock is a law paramount to all confessions, or liturgies, or directories; your committee, in their answers, would have considered themselves as called on, to have adopted a very different mode of reasoning. But let it be remembered, that our answer is directed to that statement given in by the minister of St. Andrew’s church, for himself and his congregation, component parts of the established Presbyterian Church of Scotland: And while we shall allow the most liberal toleration in matters of public worship, to other bodies of professing Christians, in this part of the United Kingdom; in no shape whatever, do we consider ourselves at liberty to infringe the Presbyterian Establishment of our country, as contained in her standards, making a part of the public law of the land, acquiesced in for a hundred and twenty years, often recalled to our memory by the solemn decisions of our church, and sanctioned by the decided approbation and veneration of the people of Scotland. Holding it, therefore, as an undoubted principle, that neither the reverend Presbytery, nor the minister of St. Andrew’s church, are entitled to legislate a new form of worship for their respective congregations, but that they are expressly bound to defend and practise that form which was demanded by our forefathers in the Claim of Rights, estab-

lished at the Revolution, and declared to be unalterable by the Act of Security and treaty of Union,—your committee flatter themselves that they shall be able to convince the minister of St. Andrew's church, and the world at large, that the judgment passed on the 7th October last by the Presbytery of Glasgow, was agreeable to the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of this our national church. And should we, in our reasoning, use any language which may seem to a stranger, to condemn any practice of public worship used by other churches of Christ, let it be remembered that it is our object solely to defend our own practice: and whatever argument of defence may assume the appearance of attack, it ariseth from the scantiness of language to express our ideas, not from any desire on our part to hurt the feelings of our Christian neighbours.

Our brother commenceth his statement by observing, that a wish had been entertained for more than thirty years, to have an Organ erected and employed in public worship in St. Andrew's church. Though this may be literally true, it can be of no importance whatever, when judging upon the legality, or even expediency of this measure. During that period, it is well known, this congregation have had two very respectable ministers, who were as desirous of pleasing their people, as faithful Presbyterian ministers ought to be. They were men of wisdom and prudence, as well as of taste. Neither of these ever attempted to bring forward a measure of this kind. Ought not this circumstance to have put our brother on his guard, especially if he be well informed, when he says, that for thirty years this

congregation have wished for an Organ. The wish of any congregation ought to have no weight whatever, to induce the minister of that congregation to infringe the fundamental laws and constitution of our established church, to which both minister and people have covenanted to adhere, and which they have promised to obey. The simple wish of a congregation might be an argument to influence the ministers of English Independents, or Scotch Seceders; but in our Established Presbyterian Church, where the direction and superintendence of the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, are committed to ministers and elders, (the office-bearers of our church acting in their legislative and judicial capacity,) such an argument seems improper, and is most certainly unconstitutional. For our brother, therefore, to have so unprecedentedly given ear to the wishes of his congregation, and hastened to obtain for them their favourite object, without even consulting the Presbytery of Glasgow in their official capacity, we do not trespass the rules of charity and politeness, when we say, was, on his part at least, bordering upon something like unconstitutional conduct. Had the Rev. Presbytery of Glasgow carried their opinion no higher than the dissentients did, on the 7th of October last, who declared the introduction of instrumental music *unauthorised* and *inexpedient*, your committee would still be justified in saying what they have now said, relative to the conduct of our brother, when he talks of having yielded to the wish of his congregation. Your committee are afraid, that this strong desire to please his congregation, may have imperceptibly warped our brother's better judgment, and in-

duced him to view that opposition which he has met with from the Presbytery of Glasgow to his favourite measure, as an opposition founded merely in prejudice, and to affirm such things in vindication of himself and his congregation, in that statement which he gave in, and is now upon record, which fair logical reasoning will not support.

Considering the polite and candid manner in which the Presbytery of Glasgow accepted at once of the declaration of our brother, that he would not again use the Organ without the authority of the church, and the indulgent spirit which they manifested, in granting him liberty to give in an explanation after the matter was decided, and even recording the whole of his argument in behalf of his opinion, your committee did not expect to have heard of such expressions as these: "The discussion was hurried on with such a storm of zeal.—Such insinuations against the people and the minister of St. Andrew's church, I can express by no other terms, than that they are a total perversion of the meaning of words, utterly confounding the nature of things.—Not free from the influence of this mistake, I am disposed to presume, the respondents" (he must mean the Rev. Presbytery, because they had adopted the paper of the respondents, prior to the giving in of his statement) "seem never to have inquired what was done in St. Andrew's church; they conjure up to themselves some horrid prostitution of sacred things, and then fight against it, as, *pro aris et focis*, wielding their arms against a shadow."—Your committee are disposed to forgive irritation even in a liberal, philosophical, and Christian mind,

when disappointed in a favourite measure; even the best of human characters are not free from imperfections, and to the imperfections incident to humanity, they are disposed to ascribe the unguarded language used by the minister of St. Andrew's church, in his statement. Perhaps your committee would be justified in saying, that in point of form, our brother had no legal title to have uttered one syllable after our sentence was pronounced. He declined voting in the cause. He dissented not from the judgment, of the harshness of which he now complains. And therefore, had the Presbytery adhered strictly to ecclesiastical form, our brother could not have been indulged in having recorded his laboured defence of his favourite opinion: nor would we, your committee, have now been called upon to answer a voluminous statement, comprehending in some parts of it, rather an attack upon the judgment of the Presbytery, than merely an indulged explanation of his own conduct upon the twenty-third of August last.

The world, to which our brother appeals, shall judge between us.

We find some difficulty in ascertaining exactly the arrangement adopted by our brother in this statement; but after the most attentive consideration on our part, we are inclined to believe that it resolves itself into the five following heads, which we shall analyze and answer in order.

1. "That the use of instrumental music in public worship is not forbidden by the word of God, but, on the contrary, is expressly encouraged, perhaps enjoined, in the Old Testament. and is clearly authorized by the New."

In his reasoning to support this his first con-

clusion, our brother sets out by observing, that
 “ there is but one fixed and infallible standard
 “ for all that regards public worship. Whatever
 “ is not agreeable to, or founded on the word of
 “ God, ought to have no place in the worship of
 “ Christians.” To this position we most heartily
 assent. It is with particular pleasure that we ob-
 serve this great Protestant principle, the founda-
 tion of our reformation from Popery, and by
 which the door is for ever shut against all the
 will-worship and superstitious rites of the Church
 of Rome, recognized and gloried in by the au-
 thor of the Statement.

With respect to his reasoning adjected to this
 fundamental principle, namely, that before the
 giving of the law, instrumental music was em-
 ployed by the twelve tribes of Israel, and that
 when we “ look into the covenant of peculiarity
 “ introduced by the ministry of Moses, no men-
 “ tion is made of instrumental music among the
 “ ritual observances of the law;”—we dare not
 give such positive assent. For a great variety
 of opinions has been entertained by learned men,
 as to the precise period when instrumental music
 was introduced into the Jewish church, in the
 public worship of God. Some have conceived,
 that it had no existence prior to David, who,
 having a great genius for music, and being him-
 self a masterly performer, incorporated it with
 the tabernacle service. Others suppose, from a
 passage in the 81st Psalm, and from another in
 Exod. xv. 21. that instrumental music, in the
 worship of God, was practised by the Israelites,
 prior to the giving of the law—“ Sing aloud unto
 God our strength: make a joyful noise unto the
 God of Jacob. Take a psalm, and bring hither the

timbrel, the pleasant harp, with the psaltery.— This he ordained in Joseph for a testimony, when he went out through the land of Egypt.” “ And Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances.” While there are others, who are of opinion, and perhaps with equal good reason, that instrumental music, in the public worship of God, was chiefly instituted by Moses, and that it forms an enactment of the ceremonial law. Thus, Num. x. 10. “ Also in the day of your gladness, and in your solemn days, and in the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with the trumpets over your burnt-offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace-offerings; that they may be to you for a memorial before your God. I am the Lord your God.” Of which last opinion is Calvin; for in his commentary upon Psalm xxxii. 2. he pronounces instrumental music a part of the “ *Pædagogia Legalis*,” that is, a Levitical institution.

But whatever opinion be adopted, concerning the precise period when instrumental music was introduced into the Hebrew church, we can never assent to the averment of our brother, “ that in a “ system of merely temporary institution, it was “ not deemed necessary, by positive enactment, “ either to forbid, or to enjoin the use of instrumental music; but it was left to the will, and “ situation, and circumstances of the worship- “ pers.” For whether we are of opinion or not, that every circumstance relative to the ceremonial law, and the tabernacle service, was shown to Moses on the mount, it is certain that David, who was raised by Divine Providence, to be king over Israel, having a great genius for music, did

either amplify what he found in the institutions of Moses, with regard to instrumental music, or did himself introduce it into the tabernacle service, believing it would contribute to soften the rugged temper of the people.

If the last opinion be the just one, namely, that it was David, who, either to gratify his own genius for music, or from believing it would contribute to soften the rugged temper of the people, added the pomp of instrumental music to the tabernacle service, which was afterwards adopted by his son in the service of the temple; then we shall be entitled to say, from a strict examination of the history of the Hebrew republic, that, like the first appointment of a king in the person of Saul, and like the building of a temple, suggested by David himself, this was a form of worship neither *commanded*, nor even highly *approved* of by God, but simply *permitted*. This view of the matter seems to be countenanced, by that marked and accurate distinction which is kept up in Scripture, when speaking of the temple service, betwixt what was positively enjoined by the ceremonial law, and what was commanded by David the king. “And the priests waited on their offices; the Levites also with instruments of music of the Lord, which David the king had made to praise the Lord.”* “And when the builders laid the foundation of the temple of the Lord, they set the priests in their apparel, with trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with cymbals, to praise the Lord after the ordinance of David king of Israel.”†

If, on the other hand, authorities are not want-

* 2 Chron. vii. 6.

† Ezra iii. 10.

ing to countenance the opinion, that there are positive enactments in the law of Moses, in favour at least of one kind of musical instruments, with which all the earth is exhorted to “make a joyful noise unto the Lord,”* the conclusion must be, that it is a constituent part of the ceremonial law. “And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the king’s seer, and Nathan the prophet: for so was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets. And the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests with the trumpets. —And when the burnt-offering began, the song of the Lord began also with the trumpets, and with the instruments ordained by David king of Israel. And all the congregation worshipped, and the singers sang, and the trumpeters sounded: and all this continued until the burnt-offering was finished.”†

Whichever of these opinions we adopt, it is evident, that the regulations relative to instrumental music, in the public worship of God, are as much incorporated with the Mosaic or Jewish constitution as circumcision, which was instituted long before the giving of the law; or as the temple itself, which was not built till after the death of David. Therefore, we are entitled to conclude, that circumcision, sacrifice, instrumental music, and the temple—the whole of these institutions, must stand or fall together.

We shall allow to our brother, that David was a prophet, and that he was actuated by the purest motives, when he set apart a particular class of

* Psalm xcvi. 4.

† 2 Chron. xxix. 25—28.

people to sing those hymns which he composed, with the accompaniment of instruments of music, improved or invented by himself. Still, it does not follow, that the worship of God should have any such accompaniment under the Gospel.

We shall even allow, that under the *Pædagogia Legalis*, all the instruments mentioned in the 150th Psalm, were daily used in the temple, and that the whole ritual worship prescribed by the law, by David, and the prophets, was in full authority, and in uninterrupted observation, until the publication of the Gospel. It remains still to be considered, whether Christianity did not dissolve the ritual obligations of the law, and entirely change many of those institutions, which relate to the worship of God.

It seems to be acknowledged by all descriptions of Christians, that among the Hebrews, instrumental music, in the public worship of God, was essentially connected with sacrifice—with the morning and evening sacrifice, and with the sacrifices to be offered up on great and solemn days. But as all the sacrifices of the Hebrews were completely abolished by the death of our blessed Redeemer, so instrumental music, whether enacted by Moses, or introduced by the ordinance of David, or if you will, of Abraham, or any other patriarch, being so intimately connected with sacrifice, and belonging to a service which was ceremonial and typical, must be abolished with that service; and we can have no warrant to recall it into the Christian church, any more than we have to use other abrogated rites of the Jewish religion, of which it is a part. Nor was there any need for a particular commandment to abolish it, as our brother seems to think, seeing that the

whole service, of which it is a part, is completely abrogated.

But as our brother states it as his first and great argument, that instrumental music is not forbidden in the word of God, but is “ expressly *encouraged*, perhaps *enjoined*, in the Old Testament, “ and clearly *authorized* by the New ;” your committee conceive it their duty, to bring forward the following reasoning from Scripture, in opposition to the last part of his averment, viz. that it is clearly *authorized* by the New.

We find, in Scripture, much information concerning great changes to be made respecting religious services under the Gospel. These were foretold in the Old Testament, and they are explained in the New. The Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, declares, that the priesthood being changed, “ there is made of necessity a change also of the law.”* We are informed by the same inspired writer, that “ the first covenant had ordinances of divine services,” which he describes as consisting chiefly “ in meats and drinks, and diverse washings, and carnal ordinances,” which he says, were “ imposed until the time of reformation.”† The carnal ordinances include all the ritual, which was addressed to the senses and imagination, but neither enlightened the understanding, nor purified the conscience. By whatever authority these were imposed, they were only to continue till “ the time of reformation.” And whatever is meant by “ the time of reformation,” it cannot be doubted that it is now past, and consequently, that the carnal ordinances imposed under the former covenant, are no longer obliga-

* Heb. vii. 12.

† Heb. ix. 1—10.

tory. They were the rudiments of the world—the shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ. The substance, which all these things represented, is to be found in the New Testament. The apostolic decree, recorded in the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles; the ministrations and epistles of St. Paul; and particularly his strictures on the doctrines of Judaizing teachers, show, that Christians are not under the law, but under grace.

From the beginning of the world, there has been a moral law, and a spiritual worship, which remain unchanged under every dispensation. Whatever is to be found in the Old Testament, with regard to either of these, is of permanent and everlasting obligation. But with respect to the modes of external worship, there was to be an entire change, which was announced by our Lord himself, in a very early period of his ministry. “The hour cometh, when ye shall neither on this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.—But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit: and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth:”^{*}—not according to the old institution, in the hour that was past, but according to the new institution, in the hour which cometh, and now is. Nor must it be forgotten, that it is not the ordinary manner of the writers of the New Testament, to inform us what divine institutions were to be abrogated, but only what observances were to take place under the Gos-

^{*} John iv. 21, 23, 24.

pel. They do not tell us that the Passover was no longer to be observed, but only that the Lord's Supper was to be administered. So, with respect to praising God, they do not expressly say, that instrumental music is to be silenced, but they do expressly say, that God is to be praised and worshipped by singing psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, with understanding and grace in the heart, for the purposes of instructing and comforting one another. This is to be the change under the Gospel, as far as psalmody is concerned.

The only point which remains to be ascertained, is, whether this necessary change of the law extends to instrumental music, as a concomitant of the New Testament psalmody. On this point, our brother has given a most decided opinion, that "instrumental music is clearly authorized by the New Testament; and that, before declaring our prohibition of Organs, it is incumbent on the church to expunge from the sacred records, these passages which seem clearly to recommend the use of instruments in public worship—that thus the worshippers may be delivered from the inconsistency of promising, and exhorting each other to do, what in their hearts they resolve not, and by the church are forbidden, to perform."

In support of these assertions, our brother exclaims, in his statement, "No where do we find the great Head of the church repealing the injunctions pronounced by the psalmist David! And it is impossible to think that our blessed Saviour would have been silent on the subject, if instrumental music had been a gross profanation of sacred things. No where do we find

“ St. Paul warning against harp, and psaltery,
 “ and Organ. Nay, we find St. John declaring,
 “ that he heard harpers harping with their harps
 “ in heaven.”

Without saying any thing more severe on this mode of reasoning adopted by our brother, we conceive that it is neither agreeable to the rules of just biblical criticism, nor to sound philosophy. We have already observed, that it is not the ordinary manner of the writers of the New Testament, to inform us what divine institutions were to be abrogated, but only what observances were to take place under the Gospel. And does not every Christian know, that during our Saviour's abode upon earth, the “ time of reformation” was not fully come—that Jesus was not yet glorified—that it was the money-changers, not the priests and Levites, that our Lord cast out of the temple; and of course, that it was the benches of the former, not the altar, sacrifices, Organs, of the latter, which he overturned? If Jesus did not destroy the temple, but only foretold its destruction, is it not self-evident that its ministers, and all the instruments employed by them, whether musical or sacrificial, must remain along with it? We shall transcribe the judgment, on this point, of an eminent Protestant divine, who is allowed, by all parties, to have been one of the soundest and most judicious biblical critics:—
 “ The Holy Ghost is here mentioned as the great
 “ gift of the Gospel times, as coming down from
 “ heaven, not absolutely—not as to his person,
 “ but with respect unto an especial work, namely,
 “ the change of the whole state of religious wor-
 “ ship in the church of God: Whereas we shall
 “ see, in the next words, he is spoken of only with

“ respect unto external actual operations. But
 “ he was the great, the promised heavenly gift,
 “ to be bestowed under the New Testament, by
 “ whom God would institute and ordain a new
 “ way, and new rites of worship, upon the reve-
 “ lation of himself and will in Christ. Unto him
 “ was committed the reformation of all things in
 “ the church, whose time was now come, chap.
 “ ix. 10. The Lord Christ, when he ascended
 “ into heaven, left all things standing and conti-
 “ nuing in religious worship as they had done
 “ from the days of Moses; though he had vir-
 “ tually put an end unto it. And he commanded
 “ his disciples, that they should attempt no altera-
 “ tion therein, until the Holy Ghost were sent
 “ from heaven, to enable them thereunto, Acts i.
 “ 4, 5. But when he came as the great gift of
 “ God, promised under the New Testament, he
 “ removes all the carnal worship and ordinances
 “ of Moses, and that by the full revelation of the
 “ accomplishment of all that was signified by
 “ them, and appoints the new, holy, spiritual
 “ worship of the Gospel, that was to succeed in
 “ their room. The Spirit of God, therefore, as
 “ bestowed for the introduction of the new Gos-
 “ pel state, in truth and worship, is the heavenly
 “ gift here intended.”*

As to the authority borrowed from St. Paul,
 by interpreting his silence as expressive of his
 approbation of harps, psalteries, and Organs, our
 brother seems not to be aware, that instrumental
 music belonged entirely to the temple service,
 and never was employed in the synagogue.
 Hence Paul, in all his journeyings, could not find

* Owen on the Hebrews, chap. vi. 4.

a single harp, or psaltery, or Organ, in any of the religious assemblies of his countrymen, beyond the precincts of the temple at Jerusalem; of consequence, warning or reproof on this subject, from that apostle, is not to be expected. This circumstance accounts for the Jewish converts never betraying, as far as we know, the least predilection for instrumental music in the public worship of God, while they discovered a strong attachment to circumcision, and other Levitical institutions. Had St. Paul, therefore, approved or admired instrumental music in the public worship of God, however poor and persecuted the Apostolic Church might be, it is not to be supposed that he would have preserved such profound silence on the subject. On the contrary, he would have disburdened his oppressed mind—he would have recorded his principles—he would have deplored the direful calamity of the times, and earnestly recommended the introduction, or the revival of instrumental music in the churches, the very first moment that the wealth, and safety, and peace of the church, rendered it practicable. But St. Paul has recorded no such sentiments. Instead of speaking in commendation of instrumental music in the public worship of God, we find him on one occasion, borrowing an allusion from it, expressive of something like contempt: “Though I speak with the tongue of men and angels, and have not charity, I am become as a sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.”*

But our brother imagines, that he is particularly countenanced in his favourite measure, by a passage in the book of Revelation, where St. John

* 1 Cor. xiii. 1.

expressly declares, that he heard “ harpers harping with their harps in heaven.”* “ Words cannot be simpler, (says our brother,) nor convey more plainly an unequivocal meaning, and that meaning clearly is, that instrumental music is at least not inconsistent with the purity of evangelical praise.” The author of the Statement then, can produce only a negative conclusion, and that from a single highly figurative passage of the New Testament, in support of his favourite measure—a negative conclusion, too, repugnant to the principles and practice of the Church of Scotland, and countenanced by nothing but what we apprehend is a mistaken commentary of Scripture. Even supposing for a moment, that, apparently to short-sighted mortals, any usage is not inconsistent with divine revelation, are we, on that account, to blend that usage with the worship of God? The Established Church of Scotland allows no such latitudinarian principle. This was precisely the mode of reasoning, by which the Popish corruptions were introduced into Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and by which any system of will-worship may be vindicated.

Our brother likewise cannot be ignorant, that commentators are by no means agreed, that the celestial state, and the exercises of the redeemed in heaven, are the subject of this vision of St. John. Whatever be in this, it is evident, that the imagery of the context is *terrestrial* and *Levitical*, and not *evangelical*. The scene of the vision is upon Mount Zion, and the voice from heaven is described as “ the voice of many waters, and as

* Rev xiv. 2

the voice of a great thunder;" evidently alluding to the region whence the water descends, and in which the thunder rolls. A lamb, Mount Zion, harpers and their harps, an hundred and forty-four thousand, elders, first-fruits—do not all these images, in their *literal meaning*, carry back the mind to Jerusalem, and place us among the Jewish worshippers in the courts of the temple? It would be in vain to expect, that, in a vision, "the forms of Christian worship" would present themselves in as familiar a manner to the mind of St. John, as the worship of the temple. For no man, no author, sacred or profane, takes his allusions invariably from what is modern or familiar. The mantle of antiquity must often be thrown around allusions and illustrations, to render them venerable and majestic; and this, we apprehend, is most judiciously done, in the passage before us, whether the subject of the vision recorded in it, refer to the church MILITANT or TRIUMPHANT.

Your committee, therefore, are bold to contend, that no better authority for instrumental music can be drawn from this highly figurative language of St. John, than there can be deduced from his allegorical description of the new Jerusalem, that heaven, the place of happiness for the righteous, is literally a splendid city, "having twelve gates, and every several gate of one pearl; and that its walls are of jasper, and its streets of pure gold."

If your committee were to borrow any thing concerning the form of evangelical praise to be used by Christians, from the book of Revelation, they would take it rather from the 6th and 7th verses of this 14th chapter, than from the 2d

verse. "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people; saying, with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Here he saw no harpers, no psalteries, no Organs. And in that beautiful and sublime description of the church universal, in chap. vii. 9. and 12. "After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; saying, Amen: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might, be to our God, for ever and ever. Amen." Here again he saw no harpers harping with their harps.

Far then from finding instrumental music in the public worship of God, "clearly authorized by the New Testament," your committee contend, that there is not a vestige of such authority, unless we violate the laws of sound criticism, and confound the literal and figurative meaning of language. Our blessed Lord did not condemn instrumental music, because it was a constituent part of the temple service, which, with other Levitical institutions, were to outlive himself, and only to be nailed to his cross, or abolished by his death. The apostle Paul could not speak against it in the synagogues, for in them it never existed. He could not warn or reprove the Jewish converts, for, as far as we know, they never betrayed a

desire to employ it. The truth seems to be this, as far as your committee can speak positively from the writings of the New Testament, there are in that sacred record but two ways enjoined of offering up our praises to God in public worship: The one by thanksgiving, without the vocal melody of the congregation; the other by the congregation singing, with the human voice, psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs. Thus, in 1 Tim. ii. 1. we have an express commandment for thanksgiving to be a stated part of our public worship. "I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and *giving of thanks*, be made for all men." And it is believed, that this giving of thanks varied according to the nature of the mercies which the church was daily receiving:* and that the people performed no other part in these thanksgivings, than saying, Amen.

The second method is, what the Scriptures enjoin relative to praising God, by singing psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs. Your committee believe that there are only four passages in the New Testament, which speak distinctly and directly on this subject. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord."† "Speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord."‡ "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray: Is any merry? let him sing psalms."||

* Eph. i. 3. 1 Pet. i. 3. † Col. iii. 16. ‡ Eph. v. 19.

|| James v. 13.

“By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name.”* In all these passages, it is an *undeniable matter of fact, that the primitive Christians understood, singing with the human voice alone, as enjoined; for this, and this only, they employed in singing to the Lord, making melody in their hearts. Among them, the accompaniment of any instrument of music, in the public worship of God, was never known nor named.*

Your committee are aware, that Bishop King would wish to persuade us, that the apostles, in the passages above quoted, recommend the use of musical instruments in the public worship of God, seeing they use a word, which, in the original language, he says, signifies singing with an instrument; *psallo*. But this very criticism serves to show upon what slender foundation the patrons of instrumental music build. Thus, the word generally used in the New Testament for *worshipping*, (*proskuneo*,) signifieth, in the original, to pay homage by the *kissing of the hand*: of course, if we are to follow the analogy drawn from the original meaning of a Greek word, Christian worshippers would only have been obligated to have paid their homage to God by the kissing of the hand. This is not all; for it is evident, that these injunctions, be their meaning what it may, are directly and expressly addressed to *all Christians*, either considered as assembled for public worship, or in their private individual capacity. Now, is it at all credible, that each individual Christian in these times, or at

* Heb. xiii. 15.

any other time, was capable of using a musical instrument; or that a suggestion, which involves a moral impossibility, could be made to the mind of the apostles by the infallible Spirit of God?

When, therefore, we concentrate all the parts of our argument together, viz. that instrumental music was confined to the service of the temple, and most intimately connected with the offering up of sacrifice, and that we have no warrant to transfer it into the Christian church, any more than other rites of the Jewish religion:—that the silence of our blessed Lord, and of his apostles, upon the subject, affords no presumption that they approved of the measure—and, finally, that the passages in the New Testament, which relate expressly to the praises of God, either allude to thanksgiving, pronounced by the minister, without the vocal melody of the congregation, or to singing with the human voice alone, psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs,—we have no hesitation in pronouncing a judgment in direct opposition to the first and the *chief* argument of the minister of St. Andrew's church. We say, that the use of instrumental music, in the public worship of God, is not authorized by the New Testament—that whether it was enjoined by Moses, or only introduced by David, it was appropriated to the temple service, and, of course, abrogated with it. The *singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs*, in the heart, to the Lord, not the *playing of them*, is the express language of the New Testament. Therefore, instrumental music is neither *enjoined*, nor *authorized*, nor *encouraged* by the word of God, in the public worship of Christians.

As to that observation made by our brother, that “when we look into the history even of

“ those nations that were strangers to divine revelation, there we find universally the use of instruments in giving praise to their gods.” We consider any reasoning, founded upon heathen examples, as of no weight whatever in deciding this question, and even as hardly requiring a serious answer. According to our brother’s own principles, “ the fixed and infallible standard” for the worship of Christians, is the *word of God alone*. What he is pleased to say proceeds from the unadulterated light of nature, we affirm, ariseth from a blind and corrupt superstition; and if we were disposed to indulge in conjecture, about the origin of manners and customs amongst the heathen, we would tell him, that Jubal, of the race of *cursed* Cain, a race which early began to corrupt the worship of the Supreme Being, was “ the father of all such as handle the harp and Organ.”* And there is no doubt, that Ham, who was born long before the flood, and of course was acquainted with many of Cain’s posterity, would transmit some of their corrupt superstitious notions of religious worship to Cush, Mizraim, and Canaan, the fathers of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Phœnicians; those nations which, ancient history informs us, first set up idols, and introduced instrumental music into the public worship of their gods.

2. Let us now proceed to the second argument of our brother, the minister of St. Andrew’s church, and examine those conclusions, which, he affirms, may be drawn from the history of the church, in behalf of his favourite measure. He affirms, that although instrumental music, in the

* Gen. iv. 21.

worship of God, was not known till “about the
 “middle of the eighth century; yet then it was
 “introduced, through the dictates of pious feel-
 “ing, prompting the enlightened mind to conse-
 “crate the labours of genius to the devout exer-
 “cise of praise.” He farther affirms, that “in-
 “strumental music forms no essential part of
 “Popery, being founded on principles widely
 “different from the ceremonies of the Church of
 “Rome, and therefore retained and employed by
 “all the Reformed churches on the continent.”—
 “A stronger argument (continues he) in its fa-
 “vour cannot be produced, except that which I
 “have already mentioned, the sacred authority
 “of Scripture.” We have fairly stated this se-
 cond argument. Our brother’s reasoning, in
 support of these bold conclusions, your com-
 mittee conceive to be very unsatisfactory.

According to his own statement of the matter,
 instrumental music was not used, for the first
 seven centuries. This period, it is well known,
 comprehends, along with the apostolic age, not
 only the *poorest* and *most persecuted*, but also the
 most *splendid* and prosperous times of the primi-
 tive church. The practice of such a period,
 will more than counterbalance any thing that
 even the *Reformed churches* on the continent can
 furnish. To pretend to account for this re-
 markable fact, upon the ground that the church
 had, during so many centuries, no leisure, or
 means, or knowledge, to attend to sacred music,
 is a very unphilosophical and inaccurate mode of
 reasoning. They had both leisure and inclina-
 tion to form the most abstruse and metaphysical
 opinions concerning the doctrines of the Gospel.
 They had means to build the most splendid

churches. The emperors of the West were devout, to a degree bordering upon superstition. The truth is, they considered it as unlawful to employ instrumental music in the worship of God. In their eyes, it was so intimately connected with the temple service, that both Arians and orthodox would have regarded themselves as returning back to Judaism, if they had permitted it in their public worship.

But we do not wish to support this branch of our argument by abstract speculative reasoning, or mere dogmatical averments. It must rest upon authorities; which authorities we draw from the accounts of the primitive Christians, as recorded in the Fathers, and from the opinions of the schoolmen, and from the judgment of the Reformers. If they knew their own sentiments, or have honestly recorded them, your committee are confident that the following authorities ought to set this question for ever at rest.

Thus, in a treatise among Justin Martyr's works, we have the following testimony. " Q. If
 " songs were invented by unbelievers, with a
 " design of deceiving, and were appointed for
 " those under the law, because of the *childishness*
 " *of their minds*; why do they who have received
 " the perfect instructions of grace, *which are most*
 " *contrary to the foresaid customs*, nevertheless
 " sing in the churches, as they did who were
 " children under the law? A. Plain singing* is

* A confusion seems to have crept into the minds of many, relative to singing the praise of God. They conceive, that because the Church of Scotland is hostile to the use of musical instruments in the public worship of God, she denies the antiquity of vocal music in the church of Christ. There is ground to believe, that the minister of St. Andrew's church, his co-

“ not childish, but only the singing with lifeless Organs, with dancing, and cymbals, &c. Whence the use of such instruments, and *other things fit for children*, is laid aside, and plain singing only retained.*

The memorable testimony of Pliny, as quoted by Tertullian, combines, at once, Christian and heathen authority on this subject. “ We find it has been forbidden to make a search after us. For when Pliny the Younger was governor of a province, and had condemned some, and made others comply, being disturbed by the great multitude of the Christians, he consulted Trajan, acquainting him, that besides an obstinate aversion to sacrificing, he could discover nothing concerning their mysteries, but that they held assemblies before day, to sing to Christ as God.”†

Thus, Basil, though he highly commends, and zealously defends, the way of singing by *turns*, or what is styled *antiphonal singing*, does not deny that the manner of singing in use during the apostolic times, was altered by him in his church.

adjutors and anonymous advocates, have fallen into this mistake. Now there are three things which the Church of Scotland carefully and accurately distinguishes. First, Plain singing, which she affirms has been in use from the beginning of the church. Secondly, Cathedral or antiphonal singing, which she takes to be neither useful, nor very ancient, being the device of the fourth century. Lastly, Musical instruments, joined with singing in the church, she maintains is the invention of a much later age—certainly not earlier than the eighth, and not in general use till the thirteenth century.

* “ *En tais ecclesiáis pro airetai ek tōn asmatōn he chresis tōn toiutōn organōn kai tōn allōn tois nepiois outōn harmodiōn kai hypoleiptai to asai haplōs.*”—Justin, Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox, Q. 107.

† Tertul. Apol.

On the contrary, he explicitly admits, that the former practice was for the people rising before day-light, to go to the house of prayer, and having made confession to God, to rise from prayer, and betake themselves (“*eis ten psalmodiam,*”) to the singing of psalms. But now, indeed, (“*dichē dianemethentes, antipsalloisin al-lelois,*”) they sing to each other, alternately, in parts.—Ep. lxiii. And so far from approving musical instruments in the worship of God, he calls them “*the inventions of Jubal, of the race of Cain,*” and thus expresses himself concerning them. “*Laban was a lover of the harp and of music, with which he would have sent away Jacob: If thou hadst told me,* said he, *I would have sent thee away with mirth, and musical instruments, and an harp.* But the patriarch avoided that music, as being a thing that would hinder his regarding the works of the Lord, and his considering the works of his hands.—In such vain arts, as the playing upon the harp or pipe, or dancing, (*pansamenes tes energeias, tōn ergōn sunaphanidsetai. Kai ontōs kaka ten apostoliken phonen to telōs toutōn apo-leia.*”) as soon as the action ceases, the work itself vanishes: so that really, according to the apostle’s expression, *the end of these things is destruction.*”—Comment. in James, chap. v.

Chrysostom, who flourished in the fourth century, often expresses his disapprobation of instrumental music, and explicitly declares, “that it was only permitted to the Jews, like sacrifice, for the imbecility and grossness of their souls, God condescending to their weakness, because they were lately drawn off from idols.” “But

“ now, instead of Organs, Christians must use
“ the body to praise God.”*

Jerome, in his commentary on Eph. v. 19. thus delivers his judgment on this point. “ We must
“ therefore sing and make melody; and praise
“ the Lord rather with the heart than the voice.
“ For this is what is here said: *singing and
“ making melody in your heart to the Lord.* Let
“ young men mind this, let them mind it whose
“ office is to sing in the church. We must sing
“ to God not with the voice, but the heart. They
“ are not artfully to supple their jaws and their
“ throat, after the manner of the tragedians, that
“ theatrical notes and songs should be heard in
“ the church; but they are to praise God with
“ fear, with good works, and the knowledge of
“ the Scriptures. If a man has an unpleasant
“ voice, if he has good works, he is a sweet
“ singer in God’s ears. Let the servant of Christ
“ so sing, that not the voice of the singer, but *the
“ thing sung*, may please; that the evil spirit that
“ was in Saul may be cast out of those, who, in
“ like manner, are possessed by him, and not be
“ let into those who have turned the house of
“ God into a stage.”† This shows, as has been

* “ *Hoti to palaion houtōs egonto dia tōn organōn toutōn, dia ten pachuteta tes dianoias autōn; kai to arti apespasthai apo tōn eidōlōn. Hōsper cun tos thusias sunshōresen houto kai tauta epetrepse sungkatabainōn autōn te astheneia.*” “ *Alla tote men organa en di hōn tas ōdas anepheron. Nuni de anti organōn kehresthai esti tō somati.*”—Chrysostom, Psalm cxlix. and cxliii.

† “ Et canere igitur et psallere, et laudare Dominum magis animo quam voce debemus. Hoc est quippe, quod dicitur *cantantes et psallentes in cordibus vestris Domino.* Audiant hæc adolescentuli: audiant hi quibus psallendi in Ecclesia officium est, Deo non voce, sed corde cantandum: nec in Tragædorum modum, guttur, et fauces dulci medicamini colliniendas; ut in Ecclesia theatrales moduli audiantur et Cantica, sed in timore,

remarked by Dr. Whitby, that choristers had then obtained an office in the church, though Jerome seems not much to approve of them. If he disliked choristers, what would he have thought of organists?

Augustine, Confess. lib. 10. cap. 33. gives his testimony in favour of plain song in the worship of God.—“ I wish all nice singing of David’s Psalms were removed from mine, and the church’s hearing; and that seems safer, to me, which I remember I have been told of Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, who made the reader of the psalm sound it with so little alteration of his voice, that he was more like to a person delivering a speech, than singing.”

Thus it is evident, from the authority of the Fathers, that it was simply vocal melody which was used in singing the praises of God, during the primitive times of the church. And should we analyze the writings of ecclesiastical authors in the middle or scholastic ages, we shall find that instrumental music is positively condemned. Thus, the celebrated Thomas Aquinas: “ In the old law, God was praised both with musical instruments and human voices.—But the church does not use musical instruments to praise God, lest she should seem to Judaize.—Nor ought a

in opere, in scientia scripturarum. Quamvis sit aliquis ut solent illi appellare *kakophōnos* si bona opera habuerit, dulcis apud Deum Cantor est. Sic cantet servus Christi ut non vox canentis sed verba placeant quæ leguntur: 1 Reg. 16. ut Spiritus malus qui erat in Saule, ejiciatur ab his qui similiter ab eo possidentur, et non introducatur in eos qui de Dei domo scenam* fecere populorum.”—*Jerom. in Ep. v. 19.*

* Vetus hæc damnataque licet a Patribus consuetudo viget hodie in Ecclesiis ubi audiuntur, theatrales moduli et dulcia cantica, quæ de domo Dei scenam faciunt populorum, convenientium ad mulcendas aures vocibus et modulis Tragedorum, quos vulgo.—*L’Opera vocant.*

“ pipe, nor any other artificial instruments, such
 “ as Organ, or harp, or the like, be brought into
 “ use in the Christian church, but only those
 “ things which shall make the hearers better men.
 “ For, by musical instruments, the mind is more
 “ directed to amusement, than to the forming of
 “ a good internal disposition. But under the
 “ Old Testament, such instruments were used,
 “ partly because the people were harder, and
 “ more carnal; upon which account, they were
 “ to be stirred up by these instruments, as like-
 “ wise by earthly promises; and partly because
 “ these bodily instruments were typical of some-
 “ thing.”—2. 2. Quest. 91. Art. 2. ad. 4.*

Others of the schoolmen might be quoted, but conceiving this to be unnecessary, we proceed to state the judgment of the reformers.

Pareus in 1st Cor. 147. declares, “ That in the
 “ Christian church the mind must be incited to
 “ spiritual joy, not by pipes, and trumpets, and
 “ timbrels, with which God formerly indulged
 “ his ancient people on account of the hardness
 “ of their hearts, but by psalms, and hymns, and
 “ spiritual songs.”†

* “ Neque fistula ad disciplinam est adducenda, neque aliud aliquod artificiale Organum, puta Cithara et si quid tale alterum est; Sed quæcunque faciunt auditores bonos. Hujusmodi enim musica instrumenta magis animum movent ad delectationem, quam per ea, formatur interius bona dispositio. In Veteri autem Testamento usus erat talium instrumentorum, tum quia populus erat magis durus et carnalis, unde erat per hujusmodi instrumenta provocandus, sicut et per promissiones terrenas; tum etiam quia hujusmodi instrumenta corporalia aliud figurabant.”—*Thomas Aquinas*, 2. 2. Ques. 91. Art. 2. ad. 4.

† “ In Ecclesia excitandus est animus ad Deum et letitiam spiritualement, non tibiis, tubis, tympanis, quod veteri duræ cervicis et stupidæ mentis populo Deus olim indulset, sed sacris concionibus, psalmodiis et hymnis.”—*Pareus in 1 Cor.* 147.

Zepperus, De Leg. Mosaica, lib. 4. says, “ Instrumental music, in the religious worship of the Jews, belonged to the ceremonial law, which is now abolished.—It is evident, that it is contrary to the precept of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xix. who wills, that in Christian assemblies, every thing should be done for edification, that others may understand and be reformed: so even that of speaking in unknown tongues should be banished from the church: much less should that jarring, Organic music, which produceth a gabbling of many voices, be allowed, with its pipes, and trumpets, and whistles, making our churches resound, nay, bel- low and roar.” And the same author, speaking of this practice being retained in some of the Reformed churches, in direct contradiction to the judgment of their founders, thus expresseth himself: “ In some of the Reformed churches, these musical instruments are retained, but they are not played until the congregation is dismissed, all the parts of divine worship being finished. And they are then used for a political purpose, to gratify those who seek pleasure from sound and harmony.”*

Molerus, in his Prelections on the 150th Psalm, says, “ It is no wonder, therefore, that such a

* “ Instrumentalis musica in sacris et cultu divino populi Judaici ad ceremonialia Mosaica pertinuit quæ nunc abolita sunt—Ut sit contra præceptum et regulam Pauli factum est, qui 1 Cor. xix. 26. vult, ut in conventibus ecclesiasticis ad edificationem omnia fiant, atque alii intelligant et informentur, quo quidem nomine linguas etiam in ecclesia ibidem rejicit, nedum confragosa illa Organa musica quæ varium vocum garritum efficiunt et templa lituis, tubis et fistulis personare, imo perboare et remugire faciunt.—In quibusdam ecclesiis Reformatis Organa illa musica retinentur, non autem nisi omnibus cultus divini partibus peractis et demisso cœtu ecclesiastico

“ number of musical instruments should be so
 “ heaped together, for although they were a part
 “ of the ‘*Pædagogia Legalis*,’ yet they are not,
 “ for that reason, to be brought into Christian
 “ assemblies. For God willeth, that after the
 “ coming of Christ, his people should cultivate
 “ the hope of eternal life, and the practice of true
 “ piety, by very different, and more simple means
 “ than these.”*

Erasmus, who was certainly a friend to the Reformation, complained of instrumental music as an abuse, and pronounced it unsuitable to the gravity and solemnity of Christian worship. His words are, “ We have brought a cumbersome and
 “ theatrical music into our churches; such a
 “ confused disorderly chattering of some words,
 “ as I think was never heard in any of the *Grecian or Roman theatres*. The church rings
 “ with the noise of trumpets, pipes, and dulcimers; and human voices strive to bear their
 “ part with them. Men run to church as to a
 “ theatre, to have their ears tickled. And for this
 “ end, Organ-makers are hired with great salaries, and a company of boys, who waste all
 “ their time in learning these whining tones.
 “ Pray now, compute how many poor people, in

pulsantur. Ad finem politicum propter illos qui ex sono et numeris oblectationem quandam quærunt quibusque huic instrumentali musica interesse libet.”—*Zepperus, de Lege Moisaica*, lib. 4.

* Non nimirum igitur tot musica instrumenta hic coacervari. Quæ cum pars pædagogicæ legalis fuerint non sunt hodie in Christianorum cætibus inducendæ. Aliis enim mediis, et simplicioribus spem vitæ æternæ et pietatis excercitiam, post Christum exhibitum suos colere vult Dominus.—*Molerus in Psalm 150*.

“ great extremity, might be maintained by the
“ salaries of these singers.”*

It is curious to observe how little our brother seems to have attended to the history of the Protestant churches; for it appears, that instrumental music would not have been retained even *among the Lutherans*, “ unless they had forsaken
“ their OWN LUTHER, who (by the confession
“ of Eckhard, a German doctor of theology)
“ reckoned Organs among the ensigns of Baal.
“ His words are, *Lutherus organa musica inter*
“ *Baalis insignia refert.*”† And, from record, it is evident, that if instrumental music is used in some of the Dutch churches, it is *decidedly against the judgment of the Dutch pastors*. For in the National Synod at Middleburg, in the year 1581, and in the Synod of Holland and Zealand, in the year 1594, it was resolved, “ *That they would*
“ *endeavour to obtain of the magistrate the laying*
“ *aside of Organs, and the singing with them in the*
“ *churches, even out of the time of worship, either*
“ *before or after sermons. So far are those Synods*
“ *from bearing with them in the worship itself.*”

As our brother seems to lay so much stress upon the practice of the Church of Geneva, where Beza and Calvin had their chief influence, your committee conceive it proper to give, at some length, the opinion of these great reformers.

Beza thus expresses himself, “ If the Apostle
“ justly prohibits the use of unknown tongues in

* Operosam quandam et theatricam musicam in sacras ædes induximus, tumultuosum diversarum vocum garritum, qualem non opinor in Græcorum aut Romanorum theatris unquam auditum fuisse, &c.

† Vide Eckhard Fasciculus contra. Tho.

“ the church, much less would he have tolerated
 “ these artificial musical performances, which are
 “ addressed to the ear alone, and seldom strike
 “ the understanding, even of the performers
 “ themselves.”*

Calvin, in many different parts of his works, gives it as his deliberate judgment, that instrumental music ought to have no place, in the public worship of God, under the Gospel.

1st. In his exhortation to Charles V. concerning the necessity of reforming the church, he says,
 “ Unless we intend to confound every thing, we
 “ must constantly distinguish between the Old
 “ and the New Testament. That although the
 “ observation of a ceremony under the law might
 “ be useful, now it is not only superfluous, but
 “ absurd and pernicious.”†

2d. Calvin elsewhere declares, “ That instrumental music is not fitter to be adopted into
 “ the public worship of the Christian church,
 “ than the incense, the candlesticks, and the
 “ other shadows of the Mosaic law.”‡

Lastly, In his Homily on 1st Samuel xviii. 1—9. his deliberate judgment on this subject is expressed at length; where Organs are particularized by him as *a profanation* of the word

* Si Apostolus meritò peregrinarum linguarum usum in cætu Ecclesiastico prohibuit, multò minùs sonos illos Musices Harmonicos, quibus aures solæ, iis quæ cantantur nullo modo, ne ab iis quidem, qui cantant plerumque intellectis feriuntur in Ecclesia tolerasset.—*Beza in Colloq. Mompelg. parte 2. page 26.*

† Nisi enim omnia velimus confundere, tenendum est semper discrimen illud Veteris et Novi Testamenti: quod ceremoniæ quarum utilis sub lege erat observatio, non superflue modo nunc sit sed absurdæ quoque et vitiosæ.

‡ “ Non aptiòra esse Cultui Divino in ecclesia Christiana instrumenta musica, quam suffitum, luminaria, aliasque umbras legis Mosaicæ.”

and worship of God under the Gospel. His words are,

“ In Popery, there was a ridiculous and unsuitable imitation (of the Jews); while they adorned their temples and valued themselves as having made the worship of God more splendid and inviting, they employed Organs, and many other such ludicrous things, by which the word and worship of God are *exceedingly profaned*; the people being much more attached to those rites, than to the understanding of the Divine Word. We know, however, that where such understanding is not, there can be no edification, as the apostle Paul teacheth, while he saith, ‘ How can a person give testimony to the faith, and how can he say, Amen, at the giving of thanks, if he does not understand?’ Wherefore, in that same place, he exhorts the faithful, whether they pray, or sing, they should pray and sing with understanding, not in an unknown tongue, but in that which is vulgar and intelligible, that edification may be in the church. What therefore was in use under the law, is by no means entitled to our practice under the Gospel, and these things being not only superfluous, but useless, are to be abstained from. Because *pure and simple modulation* is sufficient for the praise of God, if it is sung with the heart and with the mouth: We know that our Lord Jesus Christ has appeared, and, by his advent, has abolished *these legal shadows*.

“ Instrumental music, we therefore maintain, was only tolerated, on account of the times and of the people, because they were *as boys*, as the sacred Scripture speaketh, whose condition required these puerile rudiments. But in Gospel

“ times, we must not have recourse to these, unless we wish to destroy the evangelical perfection, and to *obscure the meridian light*, which we enjoy in Christ our Lord.”*

Whatever, therefore, may be the practice of some Protestant churches on the Continent, whether Lutheran or Reformed, it is evident, from the *clear* and *decided* judgment of the great founders of these churches, given by your committee, in the very words of these eminent reformers, that instrumental music ought to have no place, in the public worship of God, under the Gospel.

Perhaps it may not be improper here to take notice of what has been considered by the best informed historians, as the ancient and genuine opinion of the reformed Church of England, re-

* Quare fuit in Papatu ridicula nimis et inepta imitatio, quum templa exornare, Deique cultum reddere celebriorem existimarent, si Organa et alia istiusmodi multa ludicra adhiberent: Quibus maxime dei verbum et cultus profanata sunt. Populo externis istis ritibus addicto potius quam verbi divini intelligentiæ. Scimus autem ubi nulla est intelligentia nullam etiam ædificationem esse. Quumadmodum Paulus apostolus docet, quum ait, quomodo potest idiota reddere fidei testimonium, aut quomodo dicturus est Amen ad gratiarum actionem nisi intelligat? Quare fideles hortatur eo loco ut Deum precantes et ipsi Psallentes et precentur et Psallant intelligentia, non lingua peregrina, sed vulgari et intelligibili; ut sit in ecclesia ædificatio: Quod itaque fuit in usu legis tempore, nullum hodie locum apud nos obtinet: et rebus istis non modo superfluis, sed inanibus etiam abstinendum est: quod sufficiat pura et simplex divinarum laudum modulatio, corde et ore nostro singuli idiomate. Siquidem scimus Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum apparuisse et umbras illas legales suo adventu dissipasse. Musicam itaque illam instrumentalem teneamus tunc ratione temporis illius et populi fuisse toleratam, quod essent ut pueri, quemadmodum sacra scriptura loquitur, qui puerilibus istis rudimentis indigerent, quæ hodie non sunt ultro revocanda, nisi perfectionem evangelicam velimus abolere, et plenam lucem quam in Christo Domino nostro consecuti sumus obscurare.—*Calv. Hom. 66. in 1 Sam. xviii. 1—9. p. 570.*

lative to instrumental music. In her Homily of the place and time of prayer, we have these remarkable words: "God's vengeance hath been, and is daily provoked, because much wicked people pass nothing to resort unto the church; either for that they are so sore blinded, that they understand nothing of God or godliness, and care not with devilish malice to offend their neighbours; or else for that they see the church altogether scoured of such gay gazing sights, as their gross phantasie was greatly delighted with; because they see the false religion abandoned, and the true restored, which seemeth an unsavoury thing to their unsavoury taste, as may appear by this, that a woman said to her neighbour: 'Alas! gossip, what shall we now do at church, since all the saints are taken away, since all the goodly sights we were wont to have, are gone; since we cannot hear the like piping, singing, chanting, and *playing upon the Organs*, that we could before?' But, dearly beloved, we ought greatly to rejoice and give God thanks, that our churches are *delivered out of all those things which displeased God so sore, and filthily defiled his holy house and his place of prayer.*"

We find also, that the thirty-two commissioners, appointed by Edward VI., the most eminent men then in England, either for divinity or law, complained of cathedral singing, and advised the laying of it aside. Their words are, "In reading chapters and singing psalms, ministers and clergymen must think of this diligently; that God is not only to be praised by them, but *that others* are to be brought to perform the same worship by their counsel and example.

“ Wherefore let them pronounce their words distinctly, and let their singing be clear and easy, that every thing may be understood by the auditors. So that ’tis our pleasure, that the quavering operose music, which is called *figured*, should be wholly laid aside; since it often makes such a noise in the ears of the people, that they cannot understand what is said.”*

And it is a remarkable fact, perhaps not commonly known by the advocates for instrumental music, in the public worship of God, that in the English Convocation, held in the year 1562, in Queen Elizabeth’s time, for settling the Liturgy of the Protestant Church of England, the retaining of the custom of kneeling at the sacrament, the cross in baptism, and of Organs, carried only by the *casting vote*.†

Burns, in his ecclesiastical law, under the title, ‘*Public Worship*,’ says, “ The rule laid down for church music in England, almost a thousand years ago, was, that they should observe a plain and devout melody, according to the custom of the church, while the rule prescribed by Queen Elizabeth, in her injunctions, was, that there should be a modest and distinct song, so used in all parts of the common prayers of the church, that the same may be as plainly understood as if it were read without singing. Of the want of which grave, and serious, and intelligible way, the *reformatio legum* had complained before.”

From these quotations, therefore, from the Fathers, from the schoolmen, and the reformers, we are entitled to say, that the history of the church

* Reform. Leg. de Div. Offic.

† Vide Dr. Henry’s Hist. Stripe’s Annals, p. 363.

affords no countenance to the introduction of instrumental music into the public worship of God. That it was not admitted in the first seven centuries, can never, as our brother affirms, be accounted for by the poverty and the persecution of the church, nor by the calamities and convulsions of the times. For even supposing that Organs were too expensive and cumbersome instruments, was not the pipe, the cymbal, and the harp, a cheaper and more portable substitute? Could not Christians have carried these along with them in their flight from city to city, and hid them with themselves in holes, and dens, and caves of the earth. The Jewish captives had their harps at the rivers of Babel, and why might not persecuted Christians have used theirs, if they had thought them lawful, even in the most distressing scenes of the ten persecutions? Had they believed instrumental music to be "enjoined in the New Testament," would it not be a foul aspersion on their character, to suppose that death, in its most direful form, would have deterred them from the duty of employing it. Every person acquainted with the history of the martyrs of the primitive church, must know well, that they never shrunk from a single article of faith or worship, which they believed to be enjoined by divine authority. Paul and Silas, at midnight, in the prison of Philippi, sang the praises of God, regardless of them who could only kill the body. But the truth is, that the primitive Christians considered instrumental music neither as *lawful*, nor *expedient*, nor *edifying*. If, therefore, at least seven or eight centuries did elapse, before Organs, or by whatever name you are pleased to call these instruments, were introduced into Chris-

tian worship, and the want of them, during all that period, was never regretted by the church; it is a most decisive proof, that the primitive Christians regarded them as inconsistent with the purity of evangelical praise. Your committee, therefore, cannot go along with the assertion of our brother, "that it was ever during periods of *dawning light* that Organs began to be employed." They consider his assertion as rather problematical; nor can they well comprehend what he means by the *dawn of light* in the eighth century. Its light, in the language of the poet, may be considered as little more than "darkness visible." But whether there was a dawn or not, in the eighth century, and whether King Pepin, who devoted that Organ, the present of the Greek emperor, to the service of the Supreme Being, (notwithstanding the heroic soul ascribed to him by our brother,) perfectly understood the nature and spirit of the Gospel of Christ, your committee cannot positively determine: But they are confident, that instrumental music began to be introduced into the church, when ignorance, superstition, and the love of external pomp, had made men more desirous of having their ears delighted, than their hearts improved,—at a time, when all authors are agreed, that Antichrist was already come into the world. When our brother, therefore, affirms, that Organs were not at first "employed by the authority of "a papal decree, but by the dictates of pious "feeling, prompting the enlightened mind to "consecrate the labours of genius to the devout "exercise of praise;" he ought to reflect, that from a desire to consecrate the labours of genius in painting and statuary to the service of God,

first, admiration, then devotion, and at last worship, came to be paid to images. From allowing pious feeling to hurry the mind too far, respecting the manner in which the Gospel should be taught, or the service of God performed, we may date almost every corruption which has disfigured Christianity. The conception, that we should be more at leisure to serve God, if we could abstract ourselves from the cares of the world, paved the way for the *monastic* life. The conception that we never could mortify the body, and the lusts thereof, too much, gave rise to penance, and its train of absurdities. Mistaken pious feeling, therefore, may have led men, in every age, to add many extraneous circumstances to the worship of God, and may still induce Protestant Reformed churches on the Continent to retain them. But wise men must always despise that pomp which is merely designed to amuse children or the vulgar. With Protestant churches abroad, we have no bond of communion. We shall apply to them the words commonly used in the public evening prayer of our Presbyterian worship, "May the Reformed churches be reformed more and more!"

3d. We shall now proceed to examine the third argument adduced by the minister of St. Andrew's church, containing his reason why instrumental music was not employed in Scotland since the Reformation, and his account of that prejudice, as he is pleased to style it, which still remains against it. He affirms that it arose from the peculiar state of the civil government of the country, which, during the whole of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was of such a nature as to grant no *leisure* to the people of Scotland

to attend to sacred music ; but that the tide of human affairs is now so strong, *the hand of God guiding the progress of mind*, in matters relative to the improvement of psalmody, as cannot be resisted.

A strict and accurate attention to the history of the Church of Scotland, will indeed authorize us to conclude, that our forefathers, in matters of religion, were often tyrannically used by the ruling powers ; and that they had much to struggle with, before they obtained that form of ecclesiastical polity established at the Revolution, secured at the Union, and invariably acted upon since that time. But the same history will show, that the reason why instrumental music was not employed in public worship, in Scotland, was, because both people and teachers looked upon it as the offspring of Judaism, and abhorred it as a relic of Popery ; and too intimately connected with that prelatic form, which our forefathers never could endure. If we consult the Second Book of Discipline, framed in the sixteenth century, and the Directory, composed in the seventeenth, we will find, that our forefathers entertained the most clear and distinct ideas of what they esteemed scriptural and evangelical in church government, in discipline, in doctrine, and in public worship. And during all their struggle, from the Reformation to the Revolution, either with the popish or prelatical sovereigns of the house of Stewart, they never, for a single moment, lost sight of these four great branches of ecclesiastical polity. They declared, in the most energetic terms, that they *were reformed by Presbyters*—that they were determined to copy from no model but that of the Scriptures, as understood

by the primitive church. And from their conduct, as illustrated by the Acts of Assembly, 1638, and from their directions to their commissioners to the Westminster Divines, to be found in their letters published in the year 1644, you clearly perceive, that they most decidedly and unequivocally condemn instrumental music to be an antichristian mode of worship. Why, then, does our brother endeavour to parry the argument, by saying, "that the aversion which the Scotch nation discover to instrumental music, in the public worship of God, proceeded from the circumstance of their having no *leisure* to attend to it." In this vague manner of accounting for customs and modes of church government, you might affirm, that the *Magna Charta*, the Bill of Rights, and the Revolution Settlement, so much gloried in by the inhabitants of these lands, were all devised and obtained by *mere accident*. The truth is, the Scotch nation has no objection to instrumental music in the common amusements of life. It has been allowed by authors, foreign and domestic, that, as a people, their genius is much more musical than that either of the English, the Dutch, or the French. But the people of Scotland abhor the blending of the inventions of men with the worship of God. They conceive instrumental music inconsistent with the purity of a New Testament church. It is not strictly true, that psalmody was almost annihilated in the reformed Church of Scotland. For, in direct opposition to the assertion of our brother, there is the most satisfactory evidence, that from the Reformation, down through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, our church had leisure to pay attention to sacred music;

schools were appointed for teaching it; and even the government gave their countenance by Acts of Parliament, for the same laudable purpose. Thus, in the 6th Parliament of James the VI., 1579, " Our sovereign Lord, with advice of his
 " three estates of this present parliament, re-
 " quests the provosts, baillies, council and com-
 " munities of the maist special burrows of this
 " realm; and the patrons and provosts of the
 " colleges, where schools are founded, to erect
 " and set up *ane Sang* school, with a master suf-
 " ficient and able for instruction of the youth
 " in the said science of music; as they will an-
 " swer to his Highness upon the peril of their
 " foundations, and in performing of this his
 " Highness's request, will do unto his Majesty
 " acceptable and good service." Thus, it is
 matter of history and statute, not of opinion or
 conjecture, that both the church and the civil
 government of Scotland were not inattentive to
 psalmody. During the whole of that violent
 struggle, which existed for more than a century
 after the Reformation, betwixt Prelacy and Pres-
 bytery, the people found abundance of *leisure* in
 the year 1592, to frame the great Charter of
 Presbytery. And betwixt the years 1638 and
 1660, they had *leisure* to join in framing a Con-
 fession of Faith and Directory, and *leisure* to put
 that Directory in practice. Why then does our
 brother affirm, " that the reason for instrumental
 " music not being introduced into the public
 " worship of God in Scotland, proceeded chiefly
 " from this circumstance, that the people had not
 " much *leisure* to attend to psalmody?" Knox
 and Melville, Rutherford and Henderson, men to
 whom we owe much, were of too active a dispo-

sition of mind, and too anxious to settle our Presbyterian polity upon a firm foundation, to leave us any room for imagining that they had not attended to the minutest form of public worship. That laboured and oratorical description given us by our brother, of the character of our Scottish sovereigns, from the Reformation to the Revolution, may, indeed, serve to show that they were a most unprincipled race, but it can never serve to establish what he means to prove by it, that neither the people nor the Presbyterian Established Church of Scotland, had any aversion to instrumental music in the public worship of God; but were hindered from adopting it merely by the want of *leisure* to attend to that object, from the peculiar political situation of their country. Your committee beg leave to call your attention to the following remarkable fact, as narrated by Calderwood, in his Church History, page 674. "Upon Saturday the 17th of May, 1617, the English service, singing of quirs, and playing on Organs, and surplices, were first heard and seen in the Chapel Royal. On the 25th December, same year, Mr. William Cooper, bishop of Galloway, preached as dean of the Chapel Royal, where there was playing upon Organs: So the bishops practised novations, before ever they were embraced by any General Assembly, and therefore ought to have been secluded from voting afterwards in that matter, and condignly censured." Thus, it is matter of history, not of opinion or conjecture, that the Church of Scotland was not inattentive to psalmody; that an attempt was even made by the king and his courtiers to revive the use of Organs, and that this

was deemed an innovation so odious, that it shrunk before the scrutinizing and commendable zeal of our forefathers. This attempt was made in the year 1617, when Prelacy was established in Scotland, but notwithstanding all that royalty could do, the attempt was abortive, and the practice never extended beyond the walls of the Chapel Royal: So hostile was this church, even in episcopal times, to Organs in divine worship. The same invincible hostility appears in the year 1644, after Presbytery had been restored. It continues to operate from the Restoration to the Revolution, during the time when Prelacy had again supplanted Presbytery in our native land. It bursts forth with renewed vigour, from the Revolution to the Union, when Presbytery was once more restored and settled for ever, as the ecclesiastical government of this part of the United Kingdom. This invincible hostility procured the Act of Parliament, styled the Act of Security, and the Act of Assembly against Innovations, as barriers to preserve the purity, the simplicity, and the uniformity of our public worship. And from the Union, down to the present moment, the project which was formed a few years ago, of introducing an Organ at Aberdeen, and this late attempt at Glasgow, are the only indications of a desire to undermine the invincible spirit of our forefathers, against instrumental music in the public worship of God.

Your committee most cordially go along with the panegyric which our brother pronounces upon our venerable reformers; but are at a loss to comprehend, how this panegyric can be reconciled to the opinion which, our brother says, he has long entertained, relative to instrumental

music in the public worship of God. Does our brother seriously think, that Knox, and Melville, and Rutherford, and Henderson, were of his mind? Knox was educated under Popery, and habituated to the use of Organs from his infancy. He had travelled on the Continent; he had resided at Geneva; he had sojourned in England. All these circumstances were calculated, as our brother knows, to form and cherish a predilection for instrumental music in the public worship of God, had Knox not considered it as unlawful.

It has been said, that both Knox and Melville were obliged to yield up their own judgment to the fury of the times, and to overlook those outrages against the ancient worship, which in their hearts they condemned. Granting, that they could not control the fury of the populace in its first paroxysm, for destroying the cathedral service, could they not afterwards teach their countrymen to discriminate the *harmless* Organ, as our brother terms it, from the idolatrous image? Could they not have persuaded their countrymen, if they had thought proper, to restore the *harmless* Organ to its place in the church, as easily as they persuaded them to occupy those edifices which had been polluted by Popery? At least, if this was impracticable, could they not have regretted the perverseness of their countrymen, in banishing from public worship, such an *enchanted instrument of edification*? But Knox and Melville, Rutherford and Henderson, offer not one word in its behalf. They allow it to perish unnoticed, as a portion of that trumpety which ignorance and superstition had foisted into the house of God. Your committee are neither conscious of religious nor political antipathies,

founded in prejudice, operating in their minds. From attending to the history of the Church of Scotland, and from the studying of the genius of its people, they are perfectly convinced, that the fixed, determined opposition to the use of instrumental music, in the public worship of God, both in the established church, and amongst the various bodies of Dissenters, ariseth from *legal, political, moral, and scriptural* grounds—not from the want of *leisure* in our ecclesiastical patriots, to attend to sacred music—not from the want of money to purchase such instruments—not from the want of accommodation in our churches to use them. And when our brother is pleased to say, that the times when the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Directory were composed, were times of fierce and furious war against the Church of England;—he ought, in the spirit of fair and candid reasoning, to have added, that they were times to which Scotland is much indebted;—times in which a bold, free, devout and thinking people, opposed an attempt to enslave their consciences, and entangle their affections in the labyrinth of foolish and useless rites and ceremonies, which neither they nor their fathers could bear.

4th. We now proceed to scrutinize our brother's fourth argument, viz. That the Act of Security, the Act of Union, and the Act against Innovations, had more important objects in view, with which Organs have no concern—roundly asserting, “that, that cannot be illegal, against which no law exists—that cannot violate, which touches not the constitution.”

Your committee cannot help saying, that the reasoning of our brother upon this part of the subject, appears to them very vague and desul

tory. He at one time applauds the spirit of these acts, and vindicates the character of our Scotch patriots, who had wisdom to frame them, courage to demand them, and perseverance to obtain them. At other times, when these acts seem too pointedly and conclusively to oppose his favourite measure, he starts off at a *tangent* from the legal argument, and striveth to amuse, and even to perplex us, with subtle and metaphysical reasoning “ about
 “ the nature of sound—about a mode without a
 “ subject—and about the ever-varying, unsub-
 “ stantial nature of musical tones; exclaiming,
 “ that our national uniformity can never be bro-
 “ ken in upon, by introducing a certain quantity
 “ of modulated sound in the pipes of an Organ:
 “ And to attach perpetuity of form to things,
 “ from their nature incapable of uniform duration,
 “ would be a solemn mockery of our venerable
 “ legislators.” And therefore, what the wisdom of our church and state has anxiously guarded against, in the Claim of Rights, in the Act, 1693, for settling the peace and quiet of the church, accompanied by the Acts of the General Assembly against Innovations, was entirely directed against the *hierarchy and the Service-book, and not against instrumental music*. And in no less than three different places of his Statement, he has been pleased to say, “ That the respondents, (of
 “ course the Presbytery,) from not attending to
 “ the spirit and meaning of these laws, have
 “ argued strongly against Episcopacy, which
 “ our brother never wished to defend; and that
 “ the Presbytery have passed a sentence, which,
 “ in his opinion, goes far beyond the object they
 “ meant to condemn. That cannot be illegal,
 “ against which no law exists, *nor could exist*,—

“ that cannot violate, which touches not the constitution,—that cannot be against the genius and constitution of our church, which habitually recommends to her people the singing of the Psalms of David:” As your committee, however, conceive that the judgment of the Presbytery, upon the 7th October last, was well founded, that the *ratio decidendi* was legal and constitutional, and that the prohibition of instrumental music, in the public worship of God, in all the churches and chapels under its jurisdiction, was a wise and salutary measure; they shall take the liberty of stating, at some length, what they conceive to be the law of the land, the law and the constitution of the Church of Scotland, upon this subject. For your committee believe, that it is this argument, chiefly, which must determine the question between our brother and us.

Every opinion, founded upon the history of the church in general, or taken from the practice of foreign reformed churches, or from speculative notions of public utility, or private edification, must, comparatively speaking, be vague and desultory;—but the argument drawn from the law of the land, and the law and constitution of our own church, must be clear, positive, and conclusive. To this argument, your committee wish particularly to direct the attention of the reverend Presbytery, of Dr. Ritchie, and of the world.

When James VII. had forfeited the crown, and when his throne was declared vacant by the Scotch Convention, agreeably to the Claim of Rights, made by that Convention, the Presbyterian religion was established by William and Mary; and, agreeably to the same Claim of

Rights, Prelacy is *for ever abolished within the kingdom of Scotland*, and a form of worship, differing from the form which, at that time, was exercised by the established Church of England, was to be adopted. Now, though the use of instrumental music is certainly not enjoined by the canons of the Church of England, and though it is practised on the Continent, in churches which are not Episcopal, yet it is well known, that all denominations of Christians, both in England and Scotland, did, at that period when the Claim of Rights was framed, consider instrumental music a characteristic of Prelacy, and directly opposed to the vocal music, for which the Reformed Church of Scotland had uniformly contended. Therefore we conclude, from the sweeping clause contained in the Scotch Claim of Rights, that instrumental music was abolished along with Prelacy. And from attending to the history of the disputes which took place in England, between the Puritans and the Episcopalian church; we are entitled to say, that the Puritans considered instrumental music as intimately and essentially incorporated with the public worship of the prelatical church. This will be found to be their opinion, as recorded in Strype's Annals, and Neal's History of the Puritans.

When, therefore, the Scotch patriots demanded, at the Revolution, in their Claim of Rights, that Prelacy should be abolished, they had no reserve in behalf of any one part of it whatever, whether essential to it, or merely accidental; but fairly and candidly meant, that not only Prelatical Government, the Liturgy, and Service-book, should be abolished, but that likewise kneeling at the sacrament, the sign of the cross in baptism,

and instrumental music in public worship, should share the same fate. But as some form of worship was to be substituted in room of the prelatical, now abolished, the people of Scotland demanded, with great earnestness, in their Claim of Rights, that the doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, (including the *sum and substance* of the doctrines of the Reformed churches,) and that the church government specified in the great *Charter* of Presbytery, 1592, and a discipline, as practised in the purer times of the church,—should be granted unto their request; all which claims were heard with attention, reduced into proper form, and enacted accordingly. Now, your committee beg leave to observe, that the *outline of the public worship of God*, to be used in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, is specifically and clearly stated in the 21st chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith, which, in fact, contains the sum and substance of the Directory relative to the reading of the Word—to prayer—to preaching—to the celebration of the sacraments—and to praise;—the five distinct heads under which the Reformed Presbyterian churches arrange public worship. The Confession of Faith was framed in the year 1647, confirmed by Act of Parliament 1649; and therefore it is certain, that the framers of it had distinctly in their view the Directory for public worship, approved by the General Assembly in February, 1645, and confirmed by Act of Parliament in the same year.

In the 21st chapter of the Confession of Faith, we have the most decided and unequivocal language, relative to that part of public worship, styled PRAISE—“It is the singing of Psalms with

“ grace in the heart.” But as the Westminster Confession of Faith is not only the standard of our church, but forms an Act of Parliament, now in force, a part of the public statute law of the land, your committee, therefore, are entitled to conclude, that our forefathers intended, by the Claim of Rights, that instrumental music should be condemned and abolished, along with the other rites and ceremonies of the prelatical church. And that the form of worship, “ the singing of Psalms “ with grace in the heart,” as now in use, should be substituted in its room. Your committee affirm, that when our forefathers framed the Claim of Rights, they had the most *clear, distinct, and accurate idea* of a form of public worship, from which instrumental music was utterly excluded. We next proceed to analyze those other Acts of Parliament, relative to our Presbyterian church, which flowed from, or are founded upon, the Claim of Rights.

It is more than probable, that if we knew every particular relative to the practice of the clergy in those times, that some discrepancy of opinion, relative to public worship, had begun to appear betwixt the year 1688 and the year 1693,—most likely between the ministers which had been ejected at the Restoration, and now restored to their kirks ; men who may be considered as strict and conscientious Presbyterians,—and some of those conformists who had been educated under the Episcopalian Church of Charles and James, but who, by taking the oaths to King William, were continued in their *cures*, and who had a hankering after the rites and ceremonies of the prelatical worship which was practised in England.—Thus, in an act passed, 1693, entitled,

An act for settling the peace and quiet of the church, "Their majesties, with the advice and consent aforesaid, statute and ordain, that uniformity of worship, and that the administration of all public ordinances within this church, be observed by all the said ministers and preachers, as the same are at present allowed and performed therein, or shall hereafter be declared by the authority of the same; and no man shall be admitted, unless he subscribe to observe, and do actually observe the foresaid uniformity." But where is that form of worship specified, but in the Directory, as engrossed in the 21st chapter of the Confession of Faith, which is the "*singing of Psalms* with grace in the heart?" But if there should remain the least dubiety, concerning what idea is to be attached to the expression, "*singing of Psalms* with grace in the heart," the last chapter of the Directory completely explains it. "In singing of Psalms," says the Directory, "the voice is to be tuneably and gravely ordered, and that the whole congregation may join herein, every one that can read, is to have a Psalm Book; but for the present, where many in the congregation cannot read, it is convenient that the minister, or some other fit person, appointed by him and the other ruling officers, do read the Psalm, line by line, before the singing thereof." Your committee, therefore, with the most perfect confidence affirm, that the uniformity in public worship, enjoined by the Acts 1693, among other things, signifies the singing of Psalms with *the voice alone*.

Had the kingdom of Scotland remained an independent kingdom, possessing a separate par-

liament, as it possessed distinct laws, and a separate ecclesiastical establishment, it is probable, that the Scotch nation would have been completely satisfied with the regulations and acts already quoted, in favour of its *worship*, doctrine, discipline, and government; seeing that there was but little danger now, of its form of worship being corrupted, or altered by its own inhabitants. But, as there was a plan in agitation, for a union of the two kingdoms under one parliament, the people of Scotland foresaw, that, if this union took place, there would be greater intercourse, than formerly, betwixt the two nations. Besides, from the circumstance of our legislators being called upon to reside occasionally in a country where the prelatical form of worship was established, and from the obligation of obeying the Test Act, before they could enjoy the public offices of the state, there might be some risk that our Presbyterian mode of worship would, by degress, and imperceptibly, come not only to be *corrupted*, but *altered*. The nation, therefore, became exceedingly jealous, lest the Union, so much desired by government, should prove prejudicial to the form and purity of our Presbyterian worship. Accordingly, in Queen Anne's first parliament, it is enacted, "that it shall be high treason, in any of the subjects of this kingdom, to quarrel, impugn, or endeavour by writing, or advised speaking, or other open act or deed, to alter or innovate the Claim of Rights, or any article thereof." Most likely, this act was passed, in order to crush the rash hopes which the *Nonjurant* Church of Scotland was indulging, that the Union would gradually introduce prelatical worship. When, therefore, in 1705, the

Parliament of Scotland took into their consideration, with what earnestness the Queen's Majesty had recommended a Union betwixt her two independent kingdoms, and that commissioners were now appointed for the purpose of treating; they expressly enjoin, "that the Scotch Commissioners shall not treat of, or concerning any alteration of, the *worship of the church of this kingdom, as now by law established.*" This clause, therefore, most certainly had in view the form of worship expressed in the Directory, engrossed in the 21st chapter of the Confession of Faith, founded upon the Claim of Rights, and ordered to be uniformly observed in all the established churches of the land, and approved by the act, 1693, and ratified by the act of Assembly, 1705. Accordingly, in the next session of parliament, 1706, in pursuance of these principles and views of our forefathers, the celebrated Act of Security was passed, containing these words, "That the form and purity of worship, *presently in use* within this church, shall remain and continue *unalterable.*" And in order to avoid all ambiguity, the expressions in the act are varied, that the one may be a clear and distinct comment upon the other.

In the first clause of the act, the words are, *as presently professed* within this kingdom; and then it adds, "as now by law established;" then it adds, "*as presently in use in this church;*" and in the clause which ordains the same to be observed by all regents and masters, in every university, the words are, they "*shall practise and conform themselves to the worship presently in use in this church.*" And it is farther enacted, that the sovereigns, on their accession to the crown, shall

swear and subscribe to maintain, and preserve inviolably, the worship, discipline, rights and privileges of this church, as above established by the law of this kingdom, in prosecution of the Claim of Rights; and it is likewise statuted and ordained, “ that this act of parliament shall be
 “ held as an essential condition of any union to
 “ be concluded betwixt the two kingdoms, *with-*
 “ *out any alteration* thereof, or any derogation
 “ thereto, *in any sort, for ever;*” all of which clauses were engrossed in that act, styled the Treaty of Union, and now considered as the public law of the land, for a century past.

Now, when you analyze the counterpart of this act, as passed by the English parliament, for the security of their church, before they allowed their commissioners to treat of any union; when you observe the jealousy expressed by their parliament for the preservation of their form of worship, and the accurate manner in which they describe that form, you cannot hesitate a moment in concluding, that the Scotch patriots, at least equally enlightened, and equally zealous with their English neighbours, had a clear, accurate, and precise idea of what was meant by *the form* and purity of public worship *then in use in Scotland*.

The English, attached to the worship, discipline, and government of the ecclesiastical establishment of their own country, *enact*, that their commissioners, “ shall not so much as treat of
 “ concerning any alteration of the Liturgy, Rites,
 “ and Ceremonies of the Prelatical Church, as
 “ by law confirmed;” quoting the 13th of Queen Elizabeth, and the 13th of King Charles II., which acts the king is sworn to observe at his

coronation. Too many people, by not attending exactly to the state of the religious establishments in the two different countries, at the time of the Union—two independent kingdoms, under one sovereign, each jealous of the other; the southern part of the island remembering with disgust what they had seen practised under the government of Cromwell; and the northern, recollecting with horror, what they had suffered under the episcopal administration of Charles II.—have formed partial and erroneous views concerning the spirit of the Acts of Security of the two different countries, at the time of the Union. While each nation was exceedingly jealous that no alteration should take place in their own form of worship, it was not necessary that they should step beyond their proper ground, and, *verbatim et literatim*, condemn the practice of their neighbours, who were now to be connected by an incorporating union, under one parliament. While the English nation expressly *enact*, that no alteration should take place in their Liturgy, rites and ceremonies, as by law established, they would consider it as both injudicious and indelicate, to condemn our Directory, our Presbyterian worship, and our Confession of Faith, in open and avowed expressions. Still, however, if in the present day any English bishop should, of his own accord, attempt to introduce the Presbyterian form of worship into the established Church of England, your committee have no hesitation in saying, that it would be contrary to the express law of the land. By parity of reasoning, though instrumental music, in the worship of God, is not, *totidem verbis*, condemned or forbidden in our Act of Security, out of regard to the feelings of

the Church of England, still, as in that act, *the form and purity of worship then in use in Scotland, is to remain unalterable*; will any man, therefore, pretend to say, that if instrumental music shall be attempted to be introduced into our public worship, that it is not contrary to the law of this part of the United Kingdom? That very form of worship, *then in practice*, was to continue *in all time coming*. Now, it is known to the whole world, that betwixt the Revolution and the Union of the two kingdoms, the singing of the praises of God, in public worship, with the voice alone, was the use and practice of the established Church of Scotland.

Your committee has been at the more pains to illustrate the Scotch Act of Security, as they apprehend that both their brother and the congregation of St. Andrew's, have allowed their judgments to be misled in this question, by a mere *quibble*; conceiving, because they did not read in the act that *instrumental music was forbidden, to-tidem verbis*, therefore, that there is no law against it; but your committee maintain, that they have not interpreted the Act of Security more strictly, than its history, spirit, and enactments will justify, agreeably to the authorized interpretation of any public act relative to privilege. When a positive defined practice is commanded to be observed by any class of men, any other practice altering the former, is most certainly prohibited by the spirit of that act, though not expressed in words: and therefore, if the form of worship in use and practice at the Union was to continue unalterable in all time coming, instrumental music is most clearly, and to all intents and purposes, forbidden and condemned. And

the civil magistrate hath authority to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in our church, and that all innovations in public worship be prevented or reformed. Such, your committee hold to be the law of the land, and what they are confident in affirming, that neither the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, nor the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, can alter, without infringing the civil and political constitution of this part of the United Kingdom, as understood and ratified by the Treaty of Union. Surely, then, our brother hath not attended carefully to the spirit and meaning of those acts of parliament now quoted, when he so roundly asserts, “that cannot be illegal, against
 “which no law exists—that cannot violate, which
 “toucheth not the constitution.”

Let us now examine the ecclesiastical constitution of this part of the United Kingdom, as specified and confirmed by the acts of her General Assemblies, and your committee flatter themselves, that they will be able to show, that instrumental music in the public worship of God, is contrary to the spirit and principles of our Presbyterian church, and that the very bold and extraordinary assertions of our brother, contained in his statement, are erroneous and improper. His words are, “that cannot be against the spirit
 “and genius of our church, which she habitually
 “recommends to the people, by her appointment
 “of the singing of David’s Psalms.—Before
 “declaring her prohibition of Organs, it is incumbent on the church to expunge from the
 “sacred records, those passages which seem
 “clearly to recommend the use of instruments in
 “worship, that thus the worshippers may be de-

“livered from the inconsistency of promising
 “and exhorting each other to do, what in their
 “hearts they resolve not, and are forbidden by
 “the church to perform.”

In treating this part of the subject, your committee wish it to be understood, that every established church is entitled to arrange, in the form of a creed, a confession of faith, or a catechism, her explanation of the doctrines contained and set forth in the sacred Scriptures. This was done in the earliest times of the church of Christ, and has, with great propriety, been imitated by the Church of Scotland. Every church has likewise a right to settle her form of public worship, and to commit it to writing. By some authors, this writing has been styled a *Missal*; by others, a *Liturgy*; and by the Scotch, a *Directory*. These creeds, and confessions, and catechisms, and directories, if once recognized, established, and put under the protection of the state, that church, so protected, has it not in its power to alter or infringe the fundamental principles contained in these writings, if they mean to live under, and claim the protection of civil authority.

1st. It is true, that we in Scotland acknowledge no temporal head in matters of religion. We deny the supremacy of the king over our Presbyterian church. The executive, judicial, and legislative powers, in matters purely ecclesiastical, are vested in our church, following the gradation of her various courts; but still she must legislate, judge, and execute, agreeably to her Confession of Faith, her Directory, and Presbyterian government. These are fundamental principles, acknowledged and protected by the state, which every minister and elder is sworn to obey; and

which the civil magistrate is bound to see observed, in the most full and literal sense.

2d. Nay, so well understood is this principle in the law of Scotland, that “the magistrate has
“ authority to take order, that unity and peace
“ be preserved in the church—that all corruptions
“ or abuses in worship be prevented or reformed,
“ and the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. It is the duty of the
“ people to honour their persons, to obey their
“ lawful commands, and to be subject to their
“ authority; and as it is the proper duty of magistrates to execute the laws, it is their right
“ and duty to execute these laws which secure
“ the uniformity of our national public worship,
“ as it was practised in the year 1707.” And this they may do, by inflicting civil penalties; and if they shall omit any part of this sacred duty, they must answer for it to God and their country.

When, therefore, we take into our consideration the Directory for Public Worship, and the 10th Act of Assembly, 1705, receiving that Directory; the 21st chapter of the Confession of Faith, and the Act against Innovations, passed 21st April, 1707; in connexion with the practice of the Church of Scotland, for at least a hundred and twenty years, following out what it believed to be the constitution of our Presbyterian establishment,—your committee affirm, that instrumental music, in the public worship of God, is contrary to the principles and spirit of the Church of Scotland.

The Act of Assembly, 1707, against Innovations, which your committee are afraid their brother, in his Statement, has some how or other

overlooked, begins by observing, “ That the introduction of innovations in the worship of God, has been of fatal and dangerous consequences.” It then goes on to state, “ that the purity of public worship hath been expressly provided, by diverse acts of parliament;” and after intimating, “ that innovations either have taken, or are about to take place,” therefore, “ the General Assembly, being moved with zeal for the glory of God, and the purity and uniformity of his worship, doth hereby discharge the practice of all such innovations, and order ministers to represent to their people the evil thereof, and instruct the commissioners to use all proper means of applying to government, or otherwise, for suppressing or removing all such innovations.”

In conformity to this act of Assembly, the Church of Scotland, ever since the year 1711, have peremptorily ordained the following questions, among others, to be put in the most solemn manner, to every minister at his ordination; and his answers to these questions are known by the name of his ordination vows.

1st. “ Will you practise and maintain the purity of worship, as presently practised in this national church, and asserted in the Act against Innovations?”

2dly. “ Do you promise to submit yourself quietly and meekly to the admonition of the brethren of this Presbytery, that you will follow no divisive courses from the established worship and doctrine of this church?”

And in the Formula, which every minister subscribes at his ordination, he sincerely owns the purity of *the worship presently authorized and*

practised in this church, and that he will constantly adhere to the same; and that he will neither directly nor indirectly endeavour the prejudice and subversion thereof.

If such, therefore, be the ecclesiastical statutes of our church—if our acts of Assembly and Formula be not mere *waste paper*—and if language has any meaning, we solemnly and positively affirm, that the introduction of instrumental music, into the public worship of God, within the kingdom of Scotland, is contrary to the law and constitution of our established national church.

We cannot help taking notice of a circumstance, which tends to corroborate what we understand by the principles and constitution of the Church of Scotland. The numerous bodies of seceders, under the various names of Covenanters, Associate and Relief Synods, which have left our establishment, and declined its authority, were surely at full liberty to indulge the humour and wish of their respective congregations; yet in no one instance, has that wish or humour led them to introduce instrumental music into the public worship of God. Why? Because they conceive it is contrary to the principles of Presbytery. They have uniformly adhered to that mode of religious worship, enjoined by the Directory,—the singing of the praises of God by the human voice alone. This attachment to simple worship is so strong, and so universal, and the habits connected with it so predominant, that we may consider it as the common consuetudinary law of the country.

5th. Let us now proceed to analyze our brother's fifth and last argument.—He affirms, that the Organ “was introduced into St. Andrew’s church upon pure Presbyterian principles, and

“ *that no law exists, or can exist, against such use*
 “ *of it as took place upon the 23d of August last;*
 “ and that after the most serious attention to the
 “ subject, he cannot discover the most distant ap-
 “ proach to any violation, either of the purity or
 “ uniformity of our public worship.”

His mode of reasoning upon this part of the subject, your committee cannot help considering not only as metaphysical, but also tinctured with something not unlike sophistry. They shall analyze his argument, syllogism by syllogism. He says, “ it could not be an innovation upon the
 “ object of worship, for we worship the one God;
 “ —or on the subject of praise, for we all sing
 “ the same Psalms;—or upon the posture of the
 “ worshippers, for we all sit, as becomes true
 “ Presbyterians;—or upon the tunes, for we sing
 “ only such as are in general use;—or upon the
 “ office of the precentor, for he still holds his
 “ rank, and employs the commanding tones of
 “ the Organ for guiding the voices of the peo-
 “ ple.”

We may allow it to be perfectly true, that, upon the 23d of August last, the minister of St. Andrew's, and his congregation, worshipped *the one God*, that they sang the same Psalms as usual, that they sat as became Presbyterians, when they praised the Lord, and that the precentor held his place in the desk, &c.;—yet, after all, by introducing an Organ, as an appendage, they manifestly made an innovation on the form and purity of our public worship, in direct opposition to pure Presbyterian principles.

Such conduct was not agreeable to pure Presbyterian principles, because, in the first place, it was an innovation on the ordinary external form

of worship. For, by blending instrumental music with the human voice, that the congregation might better express the emotions of their heart, the simple melody of our forefathers becomes immediately changed into a medley, composed of animate and inanimate objects. Of course, the *very external form* of praise in use at the Revolution, is no longer continued unalterable in our Presbyterian church.

2d. It is an innovation upon what our laws of church and state denominate the purity of worship. Man being a reasonable creature, and a reasonable service being demanded from him by God, that reasonable service cannot so properly be performed by man, as when he useth his voice alone. This is the vehicle which God hath given him, to convey to his Maker the emotions of his soul. Musical instruments may, indeed, tickle the ear, and please the fancy of fallen man. But is God to be likened to fallen man? Are we taught by the letter or spirit of the Gospel, that inanimate instruments are capable of conveying to the Father of spirits, the emotions of a pious and virtuous mind, animated with religious joy, filled with religious gratitude, and awed with religious veneration, pouring forth the varied and enraptured impulses of an enlightened, converted, and sanctified soul. Organs are the mere inventions of men, played often by hirelings, who, while they modulate certain musical sounds, may possess a heart cold and hard as the nether-millstone. You may, if you please, style such music the will-worship of the Organist, but you surely cannot, in common sense, denominate it the praise of devout worshippers, assembled in the congregation of saints, to praise their God and Redeemer, in

psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace, and making melody to the Lord in the heart.

“ It is but too common for persons to deceive themselves, by imagining, that when they are greatly moved, and almost transported by the delightful airs of music, that they are then, and for that reason, in a temper of mind most pleasing to God, because pleasing to themselves;—a vain imagination indeed, and a most unhappy delusion; for men of no piety, and destitute of a serious spirit, can relish all that sort of pleasure, and perhaps even with more satisfaction, than persons of a more virtuous character. They can say unto God, ‘ Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. What is the Almighty that we should serve him? and what profit shall we have, if we pray unto him?—yet can take the timbrel and the harp, and rejoice at the sound of the Organ.”

When, therefore, our brother asks, (in what your committee conceives a *sneering manner*,) “ Does our national uniformity consist in nothing more substantial than in a certain fixed quantity of sound, beyond which no congregation has authority to pass?—What is the subject to which this uniformity relates?” Is not this a species of sophistry, which we should not have expected from the known good sense of the minister of St. Andrew’s. But we shall not answer such trifling, by opposing sophistry to sophistry. Your committee shall answer it, by this bold, but plain and honest assertion, that the uniformity of

* Job xxi. 14, 15.

our national worship consisteth in the following things:—1st. In the minister reading the Scriptures, and lecturing upon these Scriptures.—2d. In preaching to his congregation from a text of Scripture.—3d. In prayer to God, not confined to the cold and lifeless phrases of any fixed form, merely of human invention.—4th. In the celebration of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, agreeably to the words and commandment of Christ himself.—And, lastly, In the whole congregation singing the praises of God, with the voice gravely and tuneably ordered, as expressed in the Directory.—These things compose the uniformity of our public national worship:—not a certain fixed quantity of modulated sound.

When, therefore, our brother indulges in such metaphysical reasoning as the following: “What is the subject to which this uniformity relates? —That there can be no mode, without a subject to which it adheres; and, shall our national uniformity be said merely to relate to things unsubstantial, ever varying, ever vanishing, even while the ear is labouring to hear, and the mind to catch them? And, to attach perpetuity of form to things, incapable from their nature of uniform duration, would be a solemn mockery of our venerable legislators:”—your committee are almost tempted to say, that this mode of reasoning is no better than *solemn trifling*, though assuming the garb of philosophical *acumen*. For your committee affirm, that there is a precise, marked, and fundamental distinction, both in point of form and substance, between the praises of God sung by the voice,—the mean bestowed on rational man, by his Crea-

tor, for expressing the religious sentiments of his heart,—and a tune of modulated sound, extracted from a musical instrument. Mankind must be dull indeed, who cannot perceive that there is a fixed and eternal difference betwixt these two things, which no metaphysical reasoning can ever confound or amalgamate.

With respect to that part of his argument, where our brother affirms, that he is countenanced in his opinion, by the custom of admitting bands of singers into some of the Presbyterian churches of Scotland, your committee conceive that it can avail him but little. There is no innovation here whatever upon the external form of worship, for still the praises of God are sung with the human voice alone. And if ever it should happen, that this custom shall induce any congregation to neglect their duty, in joining devoutly in the praises of God, then we say, that this custom ought instantly to be abandoned. We do not deny, but that bands of singers, directing the public praise of God, have been abused; and we certainly give it as our opinion, that if ever, at any time, they shall encourage our enlightened congregations to neglect the singing of psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, and to sit mute, and listen to the harmonic warblings of a band, then they ought to be dismissed at once, as not only unpresbyterian, but highly pernicious. But the person must be very much inclined to yield his judgment to sophistry, who does not perceive a vast difference betwixt a band of singers, singing the praises of God with the voice, and completely blended with the praises of the congregation at large, and an Organ *tickling* the ear of the audience.

In the attempt of our brother to prove that he

introduced the Organ into St. Andrew's church, upon pure Presbyterian principles, he desires us to attend to the conduct of what he styles the *pure Presbyterian Calvinistic churches upon the Continent*, which employ that instrument in the public worship of God. Most likely he borrows his examples from what may have taken place in Holland or Geneva. We have no bond of union with either of these churches. They are establishments totally independent of us, and are entitled to chalk out a plan for themselves. On the other hand, their practice can have no authority whatever with us; and indeed, from what we know of the opinions entertained by some of these churches, we should be very unwilling to consider them as a proper model to copy from, either in doctrine or in worship. But be this as it may, having a right to form standards for ourselves, your committee therefore wish that our brother had confined his views, in this question, to the principles of the pure Presbyterian Church of Scotland, which we conceive to have been animated by the purest principles of any church upon earth. "In
 " our church the generous spirit of liberty breathes
 " with universal vigour, and the noble soul of the
 " Reformation animates every part of our establishment, so that no distinction was made by
 " our forefathers of days and ceremonies which
 " were alike destitute of Scripture support. Our
 " church believes it to be the great design of the
 " Gospel to raise the Christian worshipper above
 " the airy grandeur of sense; and instead of a
 " laborious service, to introduce a worship worthy of the Father of spirits."

Our brother is pleased to say, " That he is disposed to presume, that the Presbytery never

“ seem to have inquired what was done on the
 “ 23d of August in St. Andrew’s church. They
 “ conjure up to themselves some horrid prostitu-
 “ tion of sacred things, and then fight against it,
 “ as *pro aris et focis*, wielding their arms against
 “ a shadow.”

Your committee know perfectly well what was done on that day in St. Andrew’s church. They know that an Organ accompanied the public worship of God. They know that musical instruments are the invention of men. They know, that though neither authorized by the New Testament, nor by the law of the land, nor countenanced by the Presbytery, *his ecclesiastical superiors*, nor approved of by the civil magistrates of the city—that the attempt was made to introduce a musical instrument into the public worship of God, which, since the Reformation, hath in this land been considered as *illegal and unconstitutional*. Your committee, therefore, know perfectly well what was done, and their opposition to the measure hath arisen from the most complete conviction, that they were only doing their duty, when they *nipp’d* such innovations in the bud. Why then, does our brother affirm, that the attempt was made according to the pure principles of Presbytery? Was not the Presbytery of Glasgow the radical court by which such an attempt could be sanctioned? But your committee affirm, that this ecclesiastical court was never consulted on the business. Indeed, from the narrative given by our brother, this appears; for he says, “ that it was resolved
 “ by the minister, and a few heads of families,
 “ to have a meeting once in the week, for im-
 “ proving themselves in sacred music. Finding
 “ that this proposal was relished by a number of

“ the hearers, and that they gave regular attendance, it was next proposed by some of the attendants to introduce a Chamber Organ, as a help to the precentor for guiding the voices of the singers. The Organ was introduced, and was employed regularly one day in the week. When we were thus meeting together, as members of one family, it was suggested that our edification might be promoted by concluding our meetings with *family worship*. This was done, and in praise we employed the Organ; the people present were highly gratified, and became loud and urgent in their requests for the use of that instrument in public worship.”

All this is gravely related by our brother, *as a specimen, we presume*, of the pure principles of Presbytery. Now, even from his own statement, your committee are bold to maintain, that there never was procedure held by an Independent congregational society, more subversive of, or incompatible with, the pure principles of Presbytery.

It can hardly be spoken without exciting a sardonic smile: “ A few heads of families first march in procession before us—then comes a number of hearers—these are followed by a Chamber Organ and precentor—all these companies are constituted *a family*, who join in family worship within the church—employ an Organ in praise—are highly gratified,—and become clamorous for similar gratification, when, by meeting on the Sabbath day, *this family shall resolve itself into a congregation*.” Is there the most distant reference here, to the kirk-session or Presbytery, or any constituted authority in the Church of Scotland? Nor were even the magistrates con-

sulted in this stage of the business, which commenced about the beginning of June last, though occasional hearers in St. Andrew's church.

Perhaps our brother thought this would have been downright Erastianism, and inconsistent with the pure principles of Presbytery. For he again gravely tells us, that "he conceives it to be his right and privilege to direct all that concerns public worship, in the parish of which he is minister, independently of the civil power." In this assertion, your committee conceive that our brother is mistaken. No parish minister has any rights but what he derives from his Presbytery; and these cannot be legislative and judicial, they are purely ministerial. He is enabled to perform ministerial duties—to preside in public worship and sessional business, according to the rules of the church; but he has no power to depart from these rules, or to *direct* in any of these capacities. And when our brother talks so confidently of his title to *direct* all that concerns public worship, independently of the civil power, it would not have been amiss, that he had carefully perused and studied the language and spirit of the 23d chapter of the Confession of Faith.* He

* A ridiculous quibble has been resorted to, in order to blunt the argument drawn from the 23d chapter of the Confession of Faith. It has been averred, that by the civil magistrate, in this chapter, can only be meant the king; because the power of waging war and calling synods is ascribed unto him. Is it necessary to repel such a quibble by reasoning? Who does not know, that all the executive power of the British empire, is understood to dwell in the king, and to emanate from him? Does not a common summons run in his Majesty's name, as well as a declaration of war? Does not his Majesty annually delegate whatever power he has to call synods, as well as to be present at them, to his commissioner in the General Assembly? Has it not been understood, by the most emi-

would have found, that the law of Scotland has declared, That it belongs to the office of a magistrate to maintain piety, justice, and peace, according to the wholesome laws of this commonwealth. He hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, “that unity and peace be preserved in the church, that all corruptions and abuses in worship be prevented or reformed, and the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. It is the duty of the people to honour their persons, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority, from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted.” And as it is the proper duty of magistrates to execute the laws,—they are bound, and it is their right and duty to execute those laws which secure the uniformity of our national public worship, as practised in the year 1707.—This they may do by inflicting civil penalties, and if they omit any part of their sacred duty, they must answer for it to God, and to their country. Your committee, therefore, have no hesitation in saying, that the magistrates of this city might have legally and constitutionally ordered their servants to have taken possession of that Organ which was used upon the 23d of August last, in public worship, in St. Andrew’s church, without the authority of the Presbytery, until a satisfactory pledge was given, that

nent divines of our national church, from the Revolution downwards, that the Judge Ordinary of the bounds, or principal magistrate of a city, hath an inherent right, as invested with constitutional authority, “to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, and all corruptions and abuses in worship be prevented or reformed.”

it should never be employed again in a similar manner.

But as our brother, in his Statement, seems to lay so much stress upon the averment, that the Organ was introduced into St. Andrew's church upon pure Presbyterian principles, your committee deem it proper to give a short abstract of what was the real progress of this business.—About two years ago, application was made to the Lord Provost, magistrates, and council, of the city of Glasgow, then in office, “that they
“would allow certain alterations in certain seats
“in St. Andrew's church, that there might be
“room for setting up an Organ; the petitioners,
“at the same time, binding themselves to defray
“the expense, and to make good all damages
“which might be supposed to ensue, but which
“they apprehended could not arise from its introduction.”

When we examine the letter accompanying the petition, and the petition itself, containing this extraordinary request, we cannot help thinking that our brother has been disposed to treat our Presbyterian patriotic forefathers, in rather too cavalier a manner. He speaks of them as men misled by passion, and as an ignorant bigoted people, labouring under prejudice; language, to say no more of it, requiring stronger arguments in its support, than our brother has yet been able to advance. Before the Lord Provost, magistrates, and city council, returned an answer to this extraordinary request, they asked, and received the opinion of their legal assessor, who, in a very manly and candid paper, now upon the Presbytery record, gave it as his judgment, “that the introduction of Organs in our churches,

“ would be a material alteration and innovation
 “ in our external mode of worship, and recom-
 “ mended to the minister of St. Andrew’s, and his
 “ congregation, before proceeding farther, to ap-
 “ ply for the permission and sanction of the ec-
 “ clesiastical branch of our constitution.”

Your committee would have thought, that the refusal of the magistrates to grant the request of removing the seats, founded upon the opinion of their legal assessor, a gentleman so well known for his candour and constitutional knowledge of the laws of his country, might have damped this musical mania for introducing an Organ into the public worship of God. But our brother tells us in his Statement, and to which your committee beg leave particularly to call the attention of the reverend Presbytery, that although he received from the Lord Provost an official letter, upon the 22d August last, now upon your record, and the purport of which letter was to dissuade him and his congregation from making the attempt, yet that he, Dr. Ritchie, “ did not shrink one mo-
 “ ment from what he conceived to be his right.” The Organ accordingly was employed in public worship, on the Lord’s day, in St. Andrew’s church, upon the 23d August last.

There is here a little ambiguity in our brother’s Statement, which your committee do not exactly understand. Whether did Dr. Ritchie lay the Lord Provost’s letter before the committee of gentlemen, upon the evening of the 22d, or not till the 26th, the day on which he received the Lord Provost’s second letter? If the first letter was only laid before these gentlemen upon the 26th, your committee solemnly declare, that our brother did not discover proper respect to the

civil power, if he used the instrument after he received his lordship's first letter, and before he had an opportunity of submitting it to his musical council. But be this as it may, the naming of three gentlemen to wait upon the Lord Provost, and the sending two, twice in one day, to request of the Lord Provost, that the civil power might no more be seen in this business, was a piece of conduct, not at all like the good sense which our brother has displayed in the more private concerns of his life. It was apparently, first setting the civil power at defiance, and then apparently requesting them to shut their eyes to the contempt of their authority.—Your committee, taking all these circumstances into consideration, cannot help thinking, that the conduct of our brother upon this occasion, did not discover proper respect either to the civil power, or to the Presbytery of which he is a member.

Our brother surely was not ignorant of the official opinion pronounced by the legal assessor of the city council; neither was he ignorant of what is contained in the 21st chapter of the Confession of Faith, relative to public worship. Neither could he be ignorant of the power with which the civil magistrate is invested, to preserve uniformity of public worship; nor could he pretend ignorance, that about two years ago, the city council had refused to allow the seats to be removed, for the accommodation of an Organ. Why then did he, upon the 23d August last, authorize and direct the employment of an Organ, in St. Andrew's church, in public worship, taking the whole responsibility on himself, as the director of all that concerns public worship, in that parish church, of which he is minister? A line of con-

duct which your committee positively condemn. When our brother received the first letter from the Lord Provost, it was certainly high time for him to have stopt till once he got the authority of his ecclesiastical superiors, and then, legally and constitutionally, he could have said to the civil power, When you interfere with public worship, you are proceeding *ultra vires*. When, therefore, our brother sent two gentlemen, twice in one day, to request of the Lord Provost, that the civil power might no more be seen in this business, is there not more like something of a desire to dictate what the civil magistrate ought to do, “than a *sincere respect* professed for both “branches of the constitution.”

According to the Statement given in by our brother, relative to his conduct upon the 22d, 23d, and 26th August last, or even from the commencement of the business, about two years ago, we bid defiance to any man, to point out a *single Presbyterian principle* in the whole of it. Whereas, on the other hand, the interference of the Lord Provost, was strictly Presbyterian. It was the legitimate exercise of that formal power in ecclesiastical matters, which the standards of our church, and the laws of the land, uniformly assert and maintain.

As to the conception of any Presbyterian minister of the established Church of Scotland, having an inherent right of directing all that respects public worship in his own congregation, it is perfectly wild, visionary, and untenable. No minister has a legal right to perform a single judicial or legislative act, without the sanction of the kirk-session; and no kirk-session has a right

to innovate on the general laws, and universal practice of our church.

Instead, therefore, of your committee admiring these gradual steps which, our brother says, were taken by the congregation of St. Andrew's, since the 1st of June last, for the purpose of improving themselves in sacred music, they are rather disposed to imagine, that these gradual steps were intended to accustom the mind imperceptibly to innovation, and to the reception of instrumental music into the public worship of God, in this our national established church, without surprise and astonishment. Perhaps, if the Presbytery had done its duty, they should have stept forward, and nipped such innovation in the bud, convincing both our brother and the world, that the house of God, in this Presbyterian country, was not to be turned into a concert-room. But we flattered ourselves, that the good sense of our brother would have kept this musical enthusiasm within proper bounds. We were disappointed. When innovation begins, no man can say where it will stop. A man may perform an action fraught with consequences the most pernicious to his country. It may proceed from the most complete *bona fide* intention, on his part; or it may even arise from an invincible error of judgment. Your committee do not wish to speak harshly upon the motives of any human being, but the *consequences of an action*, affecting our ecclesiastical establishment, they are entitled to investigate, and to approve or condemn, as truth and justice shall demand.

With respect to that pompous declaration made use of in the Statement, to show the utility of the measure, and how wonderfully calculated an Or-

gan is to increase the devotion of a congregation of Christians, and “ that the time is now come, “ when we have it in our power to vindicate our “ church and our country from the reproach of “ neglecting one of the best means devised for “ the improvement of sacred music,”—your committee must beg leave to say, that they entirely withhold their assent. Our brother’s argument is a mere *petitio principii*—a mere begging of the question—assuming, as a principle, what remains yet to be proved. Your committee are no enemies to instrumental music being used to exhilarate the mind in scenes of conviviality, or employed to animate the soldier to march with ardour to the field of battle. Nay, they even allow that the poet is not altogether fanciful, when he says, that

“ Music has charms to sooth the savage breast.”

But still, they can by no means allow it to be an improvement of the public worship of God in singing the praises of that God who is a Spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. Your committee affirm, that the tones of the human voice, while they are the most simple, are, at the same time, the most perfect, the most accurate, the most pathetic, and the most sublime, and the best qualified to convey the sentiments of the devout heart, in solemn praise, to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Your committee have heard your *amateurs and diletanti* assert, that their nerves have been completely overcome with the powerful tones of the Organ, and the sublime *crash* of instrumental music in the oratorios of Handel. Your committee are willing to allow this musical effect, but they

believe at the same time, that all the musical instruments that ever were used, can never produce upon the devout and contemplative mind, that sublime and pathetic effect, which the well-regulated voice of 8,000 children produced, when singing the praises of God in the cathedral of St. Paul's, upon the recovery of our good, old, religious king. Away, then, with the cant of an Organ's being so wonderfully calculated to increase the devotion of Christians! Your committee have sometimes had an opportunity of listening to instrumental music, in what is styled cathedral worship; it might, for a little time, please and surprise by its novelty; the effect, however, was very transitory, and sometimes produced ideas in the mind very different from devotion. "It is but
 "too common for persons to deceive themselves,
 "by imagining, that when they are greatly
 "moved by airs of instrumental music, that they
 "are then, and for that reason, in a temper of
 "mind most pleasing unto God, because pleasing
 "to themselves; a most unhappy delusion; for
 "men sometimes of very little piety can enjoy all
 "that sort of pleasure, with as high a *gust*, as
 "persons of a more virtuous character."

Your committee believe, that when the praises of God are sung by every individual, even of a plain unlettered country congregation, (which has been spoken of by some persons rather in a taunting manner) where both the heart and the voice are engaged, the effect is much more noble, and much more salutary to the mind of a Christian audience, than all the lofty artificial strains of an Organ, extracted by a hired organist, and accompanied by a confused noise of many voices, taught, at great expense, to chant over what

their hearts neither feel, nor their heads understand.

When our brother, therefore, bewails the want of the power of discrimination in our countrymen, to perceive the advantages which would result to religion, by introducing instrumental music into the public worship of God, we, your committee, rejoice in the thought, that our countrymen will not suffer, when compared with the inhabitants of any country upon earth, as to their discriminating powers of what is useful and proper in matters of religion.

They inherit that discriminating talent from their forefathers. It was a legacy conveyed to them as purchased by their blood, and they will not abandon it for the puerile amusement of pipes and Organs. If our countrymen have not Organs, and wish not to have them, they have Bibles, and can read them;—they have churches, and they attend them;—they are distinguished for their attainments in arts and sciences;—they can study the history of mankind, and can reflect upon it;—and they know well, that Organs and instrumental music have been abused, to the purposes of voluptuousness and impiety;—they know, for Job hath told them, “that the wicked among his cotemporaries took the timbrel and the harp, and rejoiced at the sound of the Organ; and yet said unto God, Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways;—what is the Almighty, that we should serve him, and what profit should we receive, if we pray unto him?”* And they have read in the book of Amos the prophet, of a woe denounced upon them “that are

* Job xxi. 12. 14. 15.

at ease in Sion, and who trust in the mountain of Samaria; who put far away the evil day, and cause the seat of violence to come near; who lie on beds of ivory, who eat lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall; who drink wine out of the bowl, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments.”* But this very numerous description of men, in affluent circumstances, and addicted to luxurious habits,—our countrymen have read, chanted to the sound of the viol, and invented to themselves instruments like *David*. And they have also read in the book of Daniel, that when Nebuchadnezzar dedicated his golden image in the presence of a numerous and loyal assembly, “that they all fell down and worshipped the golden image, at what time they heard the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music.”†

Thus, we have endeavoured, step by step, to answer the various arguments adduced by our reverend brother, the minister of St. Andrew’s church, in his Statement.

We have in the first place shown, That instrumental music is neither enjoined, nor authorized, nor encouraged by the word of God, to be used in the public worship of Christians.

In the second place, That, from the history of the church, it appears that the Fathers, the schoolmen, and the greatest of the reformers, condemned it.

In the third place, That the reason assigned by our brother, why instrumental music, in the public worship of God, was not used in our national church—(viz. that it arose from the want

* Amos vi. 1. 3, 4. 6.

† Dan. iii. 7.

of leisure to attend to such things, or their want of money to purchase such instruments, or the want of accommodation for using them)—is neither consistent with historical fact, nor with fair and candid investigation.* Your committee have

* Whether in the period immediately after the Reformation, the public devotional music was an object of so very little attention in the Church of Scotland, as our brother is pleased to represent, may be determined, even by a very slight inspection of the Psalm Book which was used in the church during that period. In our present version of the Psalms, there are six varieties of measure; and with the knowledge of six different psalm tunes, a congregation may sing all the Psalms which it contains: In the old version there were twenty-five or twenty-six different measures, which implied a knowledge of psalmody, and a mode of singing, which could not have existed amidst that ignorance and inattention to church music, which are supposed then to have characterized and disgraced the Church of Scotland. Copies of that Psalm Book are now very rare; that which most generally occurs, is an edition printed by Andro Hart, 1635, and makes part of a volume which includes Directions for different parts of public worship, as agreed on by John Knox, and other eminent ministers, whose recommendation is annexed. So much was this part of the devotional service of our church an object of attention to those good men, that the particular tunes, proper for particular psalms, are commonly annexed to them in the musical characters of the time. And as books were not to be had so easily in those days, as in ours, an ingenious device has been employed, in order that one copy of the book might accommodate the four different persons who sang the four different parts of the music. A considerable variety of psalm tunes, set in the different parts, make a portion of this volume. Far be it from us to blame our reverend brother for his ignorance of this subject; perhaps he will blame himself for writing so decidedly upon a subject in which he must be conscious he has been at little pains to obtain information. He may perhaps see cause to regret, that, upon mere hypothetical reasoning, he should have pronounced such a severe judgment against his countrymen respecting their ignorance of psalmody in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

A pleasing little anecdote occurs, sufficient to show, that eminent men in the Church of Scotland were not so ignorant of, nor so insensible to, music, as the representations given by some persons in our days would imply.

Mr. Robert Boyd, of Trochrig, was principal of the college

proved, that it arose from the opinion entertained by our Scotch ecclesiastical patriots, that instrumental music was contrary to the genius and constitution of Presbytery in this kingdom, and to the word of God.

In the fourth place, We affirm, that from attending to the Act of Security, to the Treaty of Union, to the Directory, and to the Act against Innovations, all confirmed by the consuetudinary and common law of our church and state, acted upon for more than these hundred and twenty years, the Presbytery passed a just sentence on the seventh October last, when they gave it as their judgment, that instrumental music was contrary to the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of the Church of Scotland.

And, lastly, Your committee have shown, that the argument advanced by our brother, viz. That the Organ was introduced into St. Andrew's church, upon pure Presbyterian principles, is supported by mere metaphysical and sophistical reasoning, only calculated to mislead those who have not paid sufficient attention to the subject.*

of Glasgow. "He was a man of an austere-like carriage, and yet was a most tender-hearted man. He was of a sour-like disposition: he would sometimes call me, with other three or four, and lay down books before us, and have us sing tunes of music, wherein he took great delight."—*Livingstone's Life*. (CHARACTERISTICS.)

We believe that a copy of the above Psalm Book is in the possession of an eminent clergyman of this neighbourhood, well known for his scientific knowledge in every branch of the fine arts.

* We beg it may be remembered, what we stated in the commencement of this answer to Dr. Ritchie, that we have been all along arguing with a minister of the church of Scotland, bound by the same laws of church and state which bind the Presbytery of Glasgow.

If your committee had been disposed to measure out to their brother such language, and such reflections as he hath been pleased to make upon his ecclesiastical superiors, the Presbytery of Glasgow, they would be justified in saying, that there are some remarks in the conclusion of his statement, which, in politeness, he should have avoided. Thus, "Feeling as we do," says he, "the harshness of the sentence pronounced against us, we have confidence, that the judgment of a candid public will be, that guilt has been imputed where there was no crime, and that we have become the victims of a prejudice which we wished to remove. And instead of receiving encouragement, we have been exhibited to the world as violating the law both of the church and of the state, while we, the minister, and elders, and congregation of St. Andrew's church, are both loyal citizens, and steady in our attachment to our ecclesiastical establishment." Your committee will cheerfully allow the minister and congregation of St. Andrew's all the benefit of this pompous encomium passed upon their own conduct, by one of their own number. We cordially approve of the appeal which our brother has made to the judgment of the candid public. For, if the spirit and principles of the fathers animate the children;—if the universal, and almost uninterrupted practice of our church, in the midst of its greatest reverses, since the Reformation down to the present moment, except in three solitary instances, (the attempt made in the Chapel Royal, 1617, by the king and his courtiers, which never extended its influence farther than the walls of the chapel,—and an attempt which was made a few years ago,

by a respectable congregation in Aberdeen, but instantly abandoned,—and this late abortive attempt at Glasgow,) can consolidate the constitution, and furnish an authoritative commentary on the law of the church, and the law of the land;—if the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament, illustrated by the example of Christians for upwards of seven centuries;—if the standards of our church, explained and corroborated by the testimony of our venerable martyrs, be solid and unexceptionable documents,—then the Presbytery need not shrink from the impartial tribunal of a candid public. If what is agreeable to, and founded on the word of God, shall regulate the worship of Christians—if historical fact, and statute law—and constitutional principle—and immemorial usage—all sanctioned by an enlightened conviction, shall determine this question, then the reverend Presbytery may go with confidence, and demand a verdict in their favour.

With respect to those sacrifices which our brother hath pledged himself to make for the loyal, enlightened, and respectable congregation of St. Andrew's, your committee do not wish to restrain our brother in the smallest degree. If a sincere desire to benefit that congregation, which hath discovered such an uncommon attachment to his ministry, hath prompted him to speak in such glowing language, your committee most sincerely pray, that wherever Providence may order the lot of our brother, he may always experience a similar attachment from his congregation. If, on the other hand, this pledge “of his readiness to make sacrifices,” was thrown out, merely to announce to the Presbytery, and to the world, his fixed and resolute determination to use every lawful me-

thod to carry his favourite measure, your committee are equally ready and equally determined to use every *legal and constitutional* method to oppose him, and they have no doubt of the result.

In fine, our brother has repeatedly admitted, that in Scotland there is a prejudice against Organs, which, he says, has grown into antipathy. It was no doubt bold and manly in him, to undertake, *single-handed*, to cure that prejudice, and to remove that antipathy. And though we do not wish to infringe what he styles his sacred, private, hereditary rights, there were many objects of no small importance, to which he ought to have paid some attention, before he engaged in this difficult enterprize. For though we have not indulged in the mistake, which he says we have, of maintaining that the minister and congregation of St. Andrew's were assuming to themselves the sole prerogative of enacting a law for the whole church; yet we certainly have affirmed, that in his bold attempt to remove that prejudice, he had no title, either directly or indirectly, to undertake such a business, without consulting his ecclesiastical superiors. And we, likewise, most certainly say, that however peaceable his designs might be, they have been conducted in such a manner, as to have a tendency to produce disputes with his Presbytery, with the magistrates and town council of Glasgow, with the people of Glasgow, and with the people of Scotland. But we will not allow, that since the Reformation, our countrymen have laboured under prejudice. We will contrast with the sentiments of the minister of St. Andrew's, the sentiments of the late Principal Dunlop, of the University of Glasgow.

This venerable man, whose singular piety, great prudence, public spirit, universal knowledge, and general usefulness, are celebrated in Wodrow's History, acted a conspicuous part in the affairs of our church, from the Revolution downward, for many years. He had suffered for his attachment to the *pure principles of Presbytery*; he understood them well, and thus expresseth himself on the point at issue.

“ We celebrate the goodness of God, which
 “ carried our Reformation to such a high pitch
 “ of perfection, with respect to our government
 “ and worship, and delivered them from all that
 “ vain pomp, which darkened the glory of the
 “ Gospel service, and the whole of the supersti-
 “ tious or insignificant inventions of an imaginary
 “ decency and order, which sullied the divine
 “ beauty and lustre of that noble simplicity which
 “ distinguished the devotions of the apostolical
 “ times; and our church glories in the primitive
 “ plainness of her worship, more than in all the
 “ foreign ornaments borrowed from this world,
 “ though these appear indeed incomparably more
 “ charming to earthly minds.

“ We are sensible that it is a necessary conse-
 “ quence of the nature of our Reformation in
 “ these particulars, that there is nothing left in
 “ our worship which is proper to captivate the
 “ senses of mankind, or amuse their imagina-
 “ tions; we have no magnificence and splendour
 “ of devotion to dazzle the eye, nor harmony of
 “ instrumental music to enliven our worship and
 “ sooth the ears of the assembly. Pomp, and
 “ show, and ceremony, are entirely strangers in
 “ our churches, and we have little in common,
 “ with that apostate church, whose yoke we threw

“ off at the Reformation, or with the exterior
 “ greatness and magnificence of the Jewish temple and its service.

“ For which reason, we know we must lay our
 “ account to be despised *by the men of the world*,
 “ who value nothing that is stripped of the allurements of sense, and fancy that a rich and
 “ gaudy dress contributes to the majesty, and
 “ raises the excellency of religious service; who
 “ seek for the same dazzling pomp and splendid
 “ appearances to recommend their worship, which
 “ they are so fond of in their equipage and tables; and think that a veneration and respect
 “ to the service of the church, is to be raised by
 “ the same methods that procure an esteem and
 “ fondness for a court. We have nothing to
 “ tempt persons of such inclinations; we know
 “ they will entertain the meanest thoughts, and
 “ most disdainful notions of a worship too plain
 “ and homely for them, and fit only for the rude
 “ and unmannerly multitude, who have not a
 “ taste delicate enough for what is truly great
 “ and noble.

“ But how much soever, upon this account, we
 “ may be despised by the great and learned, the
 “ Church of Scotland, we hope, will always publicly own the simplicity and plainness of her
 “ worship, as *her peculiar glory*, and believe that
 “ these, to a spiritual eye, are beautified with a
 “ lustre which external objects are incapable of,
 “ and of too elevated a nature for the senses to
 “ look at. She is not ashamed to acknowledge
 “ her sentiments, that the devotions of Christians
 “ stand in no need of the outward helps afforded
 “ to the Jews, and that the triumphs of all-

“ conquering love, the mighty acts of a Re-
 “ deemer, all the powers and glories of an im-
 “ mortal life, which are represented to our wonder
 “ and meditation under the Gospel, are far nobler
 “ springs of devotion, and fitter to animate with
 “ a cheerful zeal, and inspire the most fervent
 “ affections, than the meanner helps afforded un-
 “ der the law—the costliness of pontifical gar-
 “ ments, the glory of a magnificent temple, *the*
 “ *ceremony of worship and power of music.*

“ Our church believes it to be one design of
 “ the better reformation of things, to raise the
 “ Christian worshippers above the airy grandeur
 “ of sense, and instead of a laborious service, to
 “ introduce a worship worthy of the Father of
 “ spirits, that should be truly great and manly;
 “ the beauty and the power whereof, should be
 “ spirit and life, and which, instead of a *servile*
 “ *imitation of the temple, should be all purified rea-*
 “ *son and religion,* and make the nearest ap-
 “ proaches to the devotion of the heavenly state,
 “ where there is no temple. And how despicable
 “ soever this may appear to earthly minds, and
 “ distasteful to the senses, that are pleased with
 “ show and appearance, we are not afraid to
 “ own, that we believe that an *imitation of our*
 “ *blessed Redeemer and his apostles,* in the *plain-*
 “ *ness and spirituality of their devotions,* and an
 “ endeavour to copy after the example of these
 “ truly primitive times, will ever bear us up to
 “ all the just decency and order of the Gospel
 “ church; and that in conformity hereto, the
 “ *naked simplicity of our worship* is beautified
 “ with a superior lustre, and shines with a bright-
 “ ness more worthy of it, than when dressed in

“ the gayest colours, and busked up with the
 “ richest and most artful ornaments of human
 “ fancy and contrivance.”

(Signed) WILLIAM PORTEOUS.
 ROBERT BALFOUR,
 JAMES LAPSLIE.
 JAMES M'LEAN.

Minute of Presbytery.

4th May, 1808.

The Presbytery being met, and constituted—
 It was moved, and seconded, that the thanks of
 this Presbytery should be given to their com-
 mittee for their great diligence in preparing the
 able answer to Dr. Ritchie's Statement, mentioned
 in last minute, which motion the Presbytery
 agreed to, and the moderator, in their name,
 gave the committee thanks accordingly; it being
 understood, that the original dissentients, to-
 gether with Dr. Taylor, jun. Dr. Lockhart, and
 Dr. Ritchie, do not concur in said vote of
 thanks.*

It was moved, and seconded, that the Pres-
 bytery should give thanks to the Lord Provost,
 magistrates, and city council of Glasgow, for the
 wisdom, propriety, and discretion of their con-
 duct, in referring the congregation of St. An-
 drew's church to their ecclesiastical superiors.

* It is to be regretted, that the original dissentients, together
 with the three gentlemen, who were indulged with liberty to
 give in explanations, should have thought it necessary, in this
 manner, to put the world in mind that they had ever differed
 from the reverend Presbytery.

The Presbytery, without a vote, agreed to the above motion; and appoint the Rev. Mr. Lapslie, (moderator,) Dr. Porteous, Dr. Balfour, and Mr. M'Lean, as a committee to communicate to the Lord Provost, magistrates, and city council of Glasgow, this vote of thanks, in name of the Presbytery; together with an extract of the Presbytery's minutes of 7th October last, on this business.

Mr. Burns called the attention of the Presbytery to two printed letters, addressed to the Lord Provost of the city of Glasgow, in which, among several other misrepresentations, the following passages are particularly submitted to the consideration of the Presbytery, viz. page 26, in which Dr. B. is said to have quoted 1 Cor. xiii. 11. to prove "that Organs were condemned, and "that they were among the number of childish "things which the apostle put away, when he "became a man." To which it is added, that this rather surprised the letter-writer, as he "had "been taught always to look up to him (Dr. B.) "as a sound divine, and one that would not "handle the word of God deceitfully."—Page 40, Mr. M'L. is represented to have said, "that "those churches that used Organs were churches "of antichrist."—Pages 48, 49, Dr. P. and Mr. L. are stated, "wantonly to have charged Dr. "Ritchie with the awful crime of perjury, in the "violation of his ordination vows;" and Dr. P. is said to have "declared that man perjured, "who would deviate one iota from the practice "established at the passing of the foresaid acts."—It was therefore moved, that the Presbytery should declare their entire persuasion, that the expressions referred to, in pages 40, 48, 49, were

not used by any member of this court: and that with respect to the quotation, page 26, from 1 Cor. xiii. 11. Dr. Balfour did not employ the above passage as an argument against Organs, but merely as Scripture language, in the way of accommodation.

The Presbytery having considered the above motion, are of opinion, that it is beneath them, as a court, to take notice of any anonymous pamphlet; but, in the present instance, they judge it proper hereby to declare, in terms of the motion, “ their entire persuasion that the expressions referred to in the 40th, 48th and 49th pages, were not used by any member of this court; and that with respect to the quotation, page 26, from 1 Cor. xiii. 11. Dr. Balfour did not employ the above passage as an argument against Organs, but merely as Scripture language, by way of accommodation.”

CONCLUSION.

It is manifest from the preceding statement, that the Presbytery of Glasgow and Dr. Ritchie have respectively made a solemn appeal to posterity, in support of their several opinions relative to the use of instrumental music in the public worship of God in the Church of Scotland. The Presbytery have always acted upon the defensive, and contented themselves with repelling the aggressions of their opponents. Self-defence, the vindication of the Lord Provost, magistrates and council of the city of Glasgow, and inviolable attachment to the purity of our religious worship, have induced the editors, who are all members of the Presbytery of Glasgow, to intrude themselves in this manner, upon the notice of their countrymen.

They have come with a plain unvarnished tale. They have confirmed it with unexceptionable documents. They have judged it fair and honourable, that their cotemporaries, as well as posterity, should be furnished with the means of deciding on the merits of the point at issue.

The candid manner in which Dr. Lockhart expresses himself, would have inclined us to pass over his explanation without any stricture whatever. But a regard for the honour of the Presbytery, requires the following remarks. Dr. Lockhart says, that "it does not appear to him that it was the intention of the dissentients to charge the Presbytery with any violation of truth and

“justice—and that it would have been desirable
 “that the Presbytery had declined employing the
 “severe language to which they have resorted in
 “their answer.” We presume not to pry into
 the motives of any class of men; but this we
 know, that the manner in which the expressions,
truth and justice, were used by the dissentients,
 perfectly authorized the Presbytery to give that
 answer which is upon record, lest the world should
 have conceived that the declaration which the
 Presbytery had emitted, was contrary to *truth*
 and *justice*.

Dr. Lockhart regrets, “that in the argument,
 “as conducted by the Presbytery, they should
 “have given any detailed statement in relation
 “to the particular case, which led to the discus-
 “sion.” How could the Presbytery conduct
 their argument without referring to the case
 which had given rise to that argument? The
 Presbytery is found fault with by Dr. Lockhart,
 for giving a detailed statement of the particu-
 lar case; and they are condemned by the dis-
 sentients, for not confining themselves entirely
 unto it.

When Dr. Lockhart, in his last observation,
 declares, that he is “unwilling to acquiesce in
 “any such application of the second command-
 “ment as would charge with false worship, our
 “Christian brethren of other churches;” it ought
 to be observed, that the Presbytery did not apply
 the second commandment in the manner here
 supposed. It is the *authoritative commentary of*
this church upon the second commandment, from
 which the Presbytery reason, and which they
 maintain, is binding upon all her ministers and
 people.

Similar candour, we have no doubt, pervades the explanation given in by Dr. Taylor, Jun. It contains, however, a critique upon the Presbytery, and some irrelevant matter, which might well have been spared. "I was out of the count," says he, "when this business commenced; I was astonished beyond measure when I heard of it, by accident, 400 miles hence; and when a final sentence was given, I had the honour of presiding in the court. And thus, from the commencement to the close, had no opportunity of taking part, either on one side or the other, in this singular business."* All this seems to be simple narrative, and yet contains such a view of the matter as cannot be passed over without animadversion. As Dr. Taylor had preserved his neutrality till the close of this business, and had even presided in the court, at that period, was this a good reason for his taking a side when a final sentence was given? Does not every one know, that the moderator of a Presbytery may have an opportunity, if he choose to ask it, of taking part in any business before that court?—and that he should be the last member of court to impugn a sentence passed under his own auspices?

The editors beg it to be understood that these remarks, and others which follow, contain not a single particle of disrespect towards Dr. Taylor, whom they highly regard. But as he has chosen to become the aggressor, it is perfectly fair to show that he has done so ultroneously, and to repel his aggression.

As to the "license taken," and "the heat and

* Vide page 46.

“passion” betrayed by the Presbytery, in the paper alluded to, the public will judge, without our commentary. But the specimen which Dr. Taylor gives “of language of this heated and “exaggerated kind,” is certainly curious. “The “manner,” says he, “in which the congregation “of St. Andrew’s is mentioned in this paper, is “surely in too lofty a style.—‘Some persons describing themselves as the congregation of St. Andrew’s church,’—this is the expression.”* Now, with all due deference, it is contended, that Dr. Taylor must have been hard run indeed for a specimen of the *lofty style*—of *heated and exaggerated language*, when he was forced to select this one. No expression in the whole paper is more calm, dispassionate, and *coldly correct*. It has not the most distant “tendency to convey the idea “that there were pretensions on the part of those “spoken of, which were not well founded.” It is nothing more than the trite, formal expression, which has long been sanctioned and recognized by practice, and might, with as much propriety, have been selected as *a specimen of the sublime and beautiful*, as of the *heated, exaggerated, or lofty style*.

Dr. Taylor does not seem to be more happy in his criticism on the epithet “insidious,” as applied by the Presbytery to the term “unauthorised.”* For if the term “unauthorised,” be of that ambiguous, equivocal kind, which naturally suggested the hypothetical case put by the Presbytery, then, neither candour nor politeness forbids the use of such a plain, though unpleasant term.

The charge of anachronism has already been sufficiently exposed.† It is only necessary here

* Vide p. 48.

† Vide Note, p. 49.

to observe, that as Dr. Taylor has been so prodigal of his politeness to the opponents of the Presbytery, it might have been expected that he would have bestowed a mite of it on the Presbytery and their committee. "A gross anachronism," is certainly a heavy charge, and not expressed in very gentle terms, especially when it happens to be utterly unfounded.* Nor can we admire the elegance of Dr. Taylor's compliment

* We can easily conceive how Dr. Taylor has fallen into the mistake on which this charge of anachronism is founded. He has not sufficiently attended to the distinction in point of time, between the invention of Organs, of which the East has the honour, and their introduction into the West, by the Greek emperor Constantinus Copronymus, who sent one as a present to Pepin, king of France, about the year 766. How long Organs had been known in the East, prior to this event, it is impossible to determine. But it is certain that they cannot be less ancient than the Council of Nice, as appears from the emperor Julian's epigram upon this instrument in the Anthologia.

"Quam cerno alterius naturæ est fistula, nempe
 "Altera producit fortasse hæc ænea tellus;
 "Horrendum stridet, nec nostris illa movetur
 "Flatibus, et missus taurino e carcere ventus
 "Subtus agit leves calamos, perque ima vagatur;
 "Mox aliquis velox digitis insignis et arte
 "Adstat, concordēs calamis pulsatque tabellas,
 "Ast illæ subito exsiliunt, et Carmina miscent."

"I see reeds of a new species, the growth of another and a
 "brazen soil, such as are not agitated by our winds, but by a
 "blast that rushes from a leathern cavern beneath their roots;
 "while a robust mortal, running with swift fingers over the
 "concordant keys, makes them, as they smoothly dance, emit
 "melodious sounds."

Long, however, as Organs have been known in the East, they have never, as far as we know, been used in religious worship by the Greek or Armenian churches. Zonaras tells us of an Organ set up all of pure gold. He adds, however, not that this was to put the church in tune, but to cast a glory upon the court, and to draw the admiration of foreigners upon the emperor. Zonar. Tom. 3. Annal. in Michaelē Imper. In the Greek liturgies, much is said of music, but an Organ is not so much as mentioned in all their books.

to the committee of Presbytery, for their "*considerable labour*." It would, perhaps, have been as consistent with the rules of politeness, had Dr. Taylor withheld *his compliment*, as well as *his concurrence*, in the Presbytery's vote of thanks to their committee.

We flatter ourselves, that the judicious reader will find, that the Presbytery have shown, not only that "the Presbyterian church must differ from "Episcopacy—that it is averse to the hierarchy "of bishops—to liturgy and read prayers—and "that it hath a discipline of its own;"—but also that both our church and state have gone "farther than all this, and accurately defined the "particulars of worship:"—And that if the Directory, the Confession of Faith, and the Act of Security have any meaning, the singing of Psalms with the human voice alone, must be regarded as one of these particulars. This is exactly what Dr. Taylor has demanded.

The editors have no desire to expose the secret history of this controversy. Dr. Ritchie has certainly communicated sufficient information in his Statement to enable the candid public to determine, whether the stirring of it ought not, from first to last, to be imputed to himself and his friends.

A scheme is apparently formed to alter the external mode of worship recognized by the constitution, and sanctioned and defined by the immemorial, universal practice of our national church. It seems to be systematically carried on, even after the Lord Provost, magistrates and council of the city of Glasgow had refused their concurrence, and declared that the ecclesiastical authorities must previously be consulted. An Organ, notwithstanding, was employed in St. Andrew's

church, at a weekly rehearsal of sacred music. By and by, this rehearsal was blended with religious worship; and when every thing was ready for this grand musical performance, it was brought up in the public worship of God, on the 23d of August last. These seem to be facts attested by the minister of St. Andrew's church himself.

Without dwelling upon the deputations to Edinburgh,—the canvassings, consultations, and convivialities at Glasgow, for the furtherance of this singular business, the editors appeal to the impartial public, whether they can here discern a vestige of deference or respect to authority, civil or ecclesiastical? Whether they can here discover any indications of the confidence of private friendship, or concern for the public peace?

With this remark the editors would have been happy to have taken their leave of this singular business. But the two anonymous letters addressed to the Lord Provost of Glasgow, on the subject of the *Organ*, render some animadversions upon them indispensable. Common fame has ascribed these letters to a minister of the Gospel. The printer, we are told, has declared, that he is not at liberty to give the name of his employer; but that he could not suppose a clergyman of the Church of Scotland would write any thing which could render him liable to damages. Some copies, we are informed, have been sent as presents to the particular friends of the author. One of these copies we have seen, with an inscription, which is presumed to be in his hand writing. Be all this as it may, the sentiments and language of Dr. Ritchie, in his *Statement*, seem, in many instances, to be borrowed by this pamphleteer; and the plagiarism is but ill concealed, by all the transposition of words, and the inversion of sentiment,

to which he has had recourse. From these circumstances, an adventitious importance is stamped upon this pamphlet, which it never could have derived from its intrinsic merits.

[Here the editors proceed to comment with severity upon the language and puerilities of the author of these letters, as well as upon various circumstances connected with their publication; and also to rebut sundry misstatements of historical facts, and etymological criticisms, which they treat as “frivolous—a mere shadow of literature, calculated to mislead the unwary.” But as the pamphlet referred to is not before the American public, it is thought proper to omit these parts of the discussion, as having little bearing upon the main question previously decided; and to take up the series of remarks towards the close, where the editors come to notice the “theology” of the letter writer.—*Am. Ed.*]

—— Alas! his theology is but sparingly dealt out, “it seems not to be derived from Locke, nor “Lyttleton, nor Luther, nor Calvin,” and what is worst of all, it seems not to be derived from the Holy Bible.—We shall confine our observations to what he inculcates relative to the devotions of Christians upon earth, and to the view he exhibits of the employment and bliss of saints in heaven.

Of Christians on earth he thus speaks, pages 36, 37. “Were all men enlightened by education, “and governed by reason and religion every “hour, then indeed it might not be necessary to “have recourse to external objects for raising “devout affections; but mankind are weak and “sluggish. The learned, as well as the ignorant, “need something to rouse the apathy of their “minds to religious exercises; and hence the ne-

"cessity of *devising* external rites and ceremonies, in order that the soul may be come at, through the medium of the senses."—"The moral effects of all the fine arts, are to humanize and improve man; and whatever can tend to excite virtuous emotions, or deepen religious impressions, instead of being rejected, should, by every good man, be warmly adopted. Were the Organ, with the *arts of sculpture*, introduced into our churches, they might produce astonishing effects on the ignorant, who are the multitude; and who, in general, in every age and country, are *only instructed* in the solemnities of religion through the senses."—We know not whether the public may have patience to read, but we have not patience to transcribe any more of this very dangerous, and we must add, popish delusion. If "the spirituality of the Gospel forbade not this vain deceit," then every man may, both in divinity and morality, do that which is right in his own eyes. The Papist, according to this mode of reasoning, has better means of being instructed in the solemnities of religion, than the Protestant, for he enjoys all the benefit of Organs, pictures, images, &c. According to this mode of reasoning, the people of England must be more intelligent in divinity, and purer in their morals, than the inhabitants of Scotland, for "the dormant feelings of their souls are roused with irresistible force, by the *grand* and *solemn* symphonies of the Organ." According to this letter writer's plan, our blessed Lord's command to his apostles, to teach all nations, or first to enlighten the understandings of men, would be superfluous. The work of the Spirit of God, upon the soul of man, might then be accomplished by human means, or resolved into "the moral effects of the

“fine arts.”—Instead of stopping short at instrumental music, we instantly wander and are lost among pictures, and statues, and endless contrivances of a similar superstitious tendency. Does the letter writer mean, that Christians should rather be guided in their devotions by the rhapsody of Bruyere, than by the writings of St. Paul?

In his commentary on the beatific vision of John in the Revelation, the letter writer seems to indicate, that heaven is a school in which the fine arts are cultivated, and furnish no inconsiderable portion of the happiness of the redeemed. “The redeemed,” page 33, says he, “are represented “as having the HARPS OF GOD in their hands, “and singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. “Is it *lawful*, then, in the immediate presence of “Infinite Purity himself, for the happy, in their “hallelujahs, to use harps?—Can any thing *used* “in the worship of heaven, by the church *triumphant*, be *sinful* in the church *militant*?” Can this indeed be the view that St. John has given us of the redeemed, and their celestial employment, in the book of Revelation? How different from the doctrine he has taught in his 1st Epist. iii. 2. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know, that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.” Is this the view which St. Paul has exhibited of paradise, after he had been caught up into it? He heard sounds, indeed, and was ravished with them; but they were articulate sounds, they were addressed to the *understanding*. “He heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.” This is the infallible report that Paul has brought us of paradise, after having been caught up into it. The reader will judge whether

the paradise of the apostles has been justly represented by this anonymous pamphleteer.

It is perfectly unnecessary to dwell any longer upon this pamphlet. As to his sneer at the manner in which the Presbytery arranged their arguments, which he seasons with a quotation from D'Alembert—that arrangement was adopted by Dr. Ritchie, in his speech, prior to a single word being uttered by the Presbytery on the subject. When he insinuates, that the Presbytery hath pronounced instrumental music, in its very nature, profane and sinful—the answer is, that the Presbytery never uttered a syllable, reflecting on, or condemning the use of it, in any church of Christ, but in their own. When he asserts, that Organs were preserved not only by a Melancthon and a Zuinglius, but by Calvinists themselves, and even in Calvin's own church at Geneva, the assertion is false.*

His argument, that by rejecting instrumental music, in the public worship of God, we virtually abolish the Psalms of David, is confuted by our uniform practice. We admire them—we retain them—we sing them with the *understanding*, and with the *heart*. When he introduces the abstract, but very important question, whether not only the ideas, but the very words of Scripture were inspired, he ought to recollect that this is a question of too much magnitude and delicacy for *him* to determine.—

* “The only amusement,” says Dr. Burney, “which Calvin seems ever to have allowed his followers, was *psalmody*, and that of the most unmeaning and monotonous kind; without harmony, variety of accent, rythm, and most of the constituent parts of mere melody. Not a *musical instrument* was suffered within the walls of Geneva for more than a hundred years after the Reformation; and all music, except this metrical psalmody, was proscribed, wherever the doctrines of this reformer were received.”—*Hist. Music*, vol. 3, p. 4.

Finally, he seems not a little to countenance the method of translating and interpreting Scripture, adopted by Socinians, and those who would be wise above what is written; arrogantly condemning the translation presently in use in our land, sanctioned by the king, and authorized by the church; vainly pretending to give more accurately the meaning of a passage, by analyzing the original word as used by profane authors,—a mode of criticism which has been destructive of the interests of truth and virtue wherever it has been adopted. The venerable professor of theology in this university, hath shown, in the most convincing manner, that Scripture is the best interpreter of Scripture; and that such men as Dr. Geddes, by inveigling the unwary into critical disquisitions about the meaning of the original, have been acting as pioneers of error and infidelity.

Among such a crowd of blemishes in this pamphlet, very few beauties indeed appear.

The author may have been animated with ardent friendship to Dr. Ritchie, when, in the spirit of knight errantry, he sallied forth as the champion of the Organ. But alas!

*Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis,
Tempus eget.*—

Priam was as fit for driving the Greeks out of Troy, as this pamphleteer is for vindicating his friend, or for defending the cause he has espoused.

We cannot conclude, without taking notice of the time in which this pamphlet was ushered into the world. Upon Saturday the 9th of April last, the day immediately preceding the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the city of Glasgow—a day devoted to serious preparation for that solemn

ordinance, an advertisement appeared in the Glasgow courier, announcing this publication for Monday following, and giving the title page of it at length. The Lord Provost of Glasgow, when coming from public worship, and going home to the devotions of the family and closet, was held up to public view, as

“ Playing such fantastic tricks before high Heaven,
“ As make the angels weep.”

Habitually influenced as that gentleman is, by just views of religion, it is scarcely to be conceived, but that his mind, on that solemn occasion, would be painfully disturbed by so rude and unchristian a provocation. The curiosity of the citizens was wound up to the highest pitch. Conjectures about the author, and the contents of these letters, were set afloat; party spirit was roused, and the minds of intending communicants were withdrawn from self-examination, from Christian charity, and from the contemplation of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord's day was diverted too much from its proper purpose; and a communion Sabbath turned into a day of suspense and distraction, about these letters and their author. This author, if indeed a clergyman of the Church of Scotland, and if officially employed to assist in dispensing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper on this occasion, presiding at the Lord's table!—(trembling cometh upon us; the Psalmist shall finish the description)—He hath put forth his hand against “such as were at peace with him: he hath broken his covenant. The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart: his words were softer than oil, yet were they drawn swords.”*

* Psalm lv. 20, 21.

The editors beg it to be remembered, that they apply this description to no individual. They are willing to believe that no minister of the Gospel could act so culpable and unprincipled a part.

Though they at first conceived it sufficient to have left their names with the printer, yet upon more mature consideration, they judge it more respectful to the public to subscribe their names.

WILLIAM PORTEOUS.

JOHN BURNS.

JAMES LAPSLIE.

ROBERT RENNIE.

JOHN POLLOCK.

JAMES M'LEAN.



In the note, page 182, where the Greek and Armenian churches are mentioned, as not using instrumental music, we ought likewise to have added the Russian, a branch of the Greek church. For though the emperor be considered as the head of that church, yet no music is allowed in the public worship of God, but vocal music.

TO THE

*Reverend Judicatories of the Presbyterian
Church, in the United States.*



WITH that respectful regard due to the ministering pastors of that church, to which the author of the following remarks was early introduced by pious parents; and in the prosperity of which, as a Christian church of purest form and principles, he may justly continue to rejoice; he has been induced, thus publicly, to submit the peculiar circumstances in which he found himself and family placed, by the unauthorised introduction of instrumental music into public worship, in that house of God, where he had been for many years a regular member.

The foundation of the Presbyterian church was laid upon the ground, cleared by the Reformation from the rubbish and machinery of an artificial and corrupted church; and its simple form reared, in place of the fantastic structures of superstition, upon the delineations and practice of our Saviour and his apostles. It was approved, and partly established by law, in the countries from which our population has been principally derived. And indeed the attachment to it, occasioned

the abandonment of all their interests there, and their hazardous settlement here, in rejection of a formal and pompous worship, with all the countenance of wealth and power, which has always accompanied and enforced it. Nor was a fear of similar imposition, by force or fraud, wanting among the feelings that gave birth to our Revolution: And the conduct of a particular body of clergy, in opposition to that event, sufficiently denoted the temper prevailing in such churches.

Soon after the Revolutionary war, the Presbyterian church in the United States, issued and circulated, through all its Presbyteries, certain constitutional standards for doctrine, government and discipline; and for a "*Directory of Public Worship*;" being, in all these respects, the same as those of the Church of Scotland; and identified with those of the Westminster Divines, digested, ratified and sanctioned, in the purest days of the Reformation.

This Constitution, after seasonable perusal, and due consideration, by all the ministers and members of the church, was to be adopted or rejected, as a majority of the General Assembly might direct, agreeably to the instructions received for that purpose from the several Presbyteries.

It was accordingly so adopted and sanctioned by act of the General Assembly; and

every preacher of the Gospel, since licensed for that purpose; every member, when first admitted to solemn ordinances; and every pastor, set apart and ordained to a charge,—have been solemnly tested, as in the presence of God, not only for a simple approbation of that Constitution, in all its parts, but also for their *unequivocal* acceptance of it, as founded on the word of God.

In what respects, or to what extent, innovations have taken place, in that so solemnly sanctioned Constitution, ye who stand the appointed watchmen in the church of Christ, can best determine. But to an individual, who feels his personal obligations as a member,—though under a responsibility far less solemn and awful than ye have assumed who minister in holy things,—some obvious innovations, in our constitutional standards, have been, and still are, subjects of the deepest regret.

Nor is it the least grievous portion of this, that though such inroads have become public and notorious, no judicial steps, known to him who now addresses you, have yet been taken in the judicatories, either effectually to prevent, or explicitly to bear testimony against, some of the most glaring—especially the introduction of *instrumental music*.

It is not intended here, to develope the aberrations that may have occurred, through

the wide boundaries of the church under your care and vigilance. Against every instance of that kind, it may be impossible to guard, by the utmost jealousy and watchfulness. But, beside the public effect, the hardship to which an individual worshipper has been subjected, in that corner of the church where his lot was cast, becomes a proper subject of serious representation. Especially, when several others, as well as his own family, have not only been aggrieved in the same respect, but even totally separated from the benefit and privileges of that church to which they were attached, and in which they held an interest; and the privileges of which they had, previously, enjoyed from their infancy.

It will be a proof of the writer's freedom from any censorious disposition, in making the present address, that he has abstained from all public reflections on these matters, for a series of years—That, while he felt an irresistible obligation to set his face against a measure, indirectly misrepresenting the nature of that God, who has so fully declared in his word, that he regards nothing external, but looks to the heart,—a measure which mingles with his worship that which affects only the outward senses, and for which the solemn charge addresses itself to us, “Who hath required this at your hands?”—While he considered it an addition to

God's worship of their own fancy, and for their own gratification, who introduced it; while it imposed a yoke not laid by Him whose authority alone is acknowledged by the church; and in the manner of the procedure violating the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government; overthrowing together, private rights with public institutions—That yet, notwithstanding all this, avoiding division and strife, he bore the injustice; and having expressed his sense of it, and declared his apprehension of the unhappy consequences, in a letter* to the committee of the church; that letter remaining unanswered, unnoticed; and the writer still unconvinced of his error,—he relinquished his seat, and silently withdrew to private worship, or to its public performance, in other Christian assemblies; with whom, indeed, he could cordially join, though with much inconvenience and derangement to those whom he was bound to lead and keep together.

If it still be asked, why no reference was made to the judicatories of the church, in a case affecting its order and worship, as well as the rights of the congregation? It may be answered farther, that this particular innovation appearing to be, *indirectly*, sanctioned by the acquiescence of our Presbytery and

*. See a copy of that letter at the close of this address

Synod, it was sufficient to admonish an individual, that his complaints might be vainly offered on the subject. Nor could relief be attained, but by such processes as did not comport with the employments of the writer to pursue. The congregation also, having submitted to the disposition of a few members, in another case, whereby their own order and appointment were set at nought, in establishing a pecuniary allowance to the minister,—it might have appeared as arrogating too much to himself, for any one to place his individual objections in opposition to the wishes of the pastor, and the same supporters, with the *apparent* approbation of a whole Presbytery and Synod.

It may not be amiss to mention, that previous to the singular introduction of an Organ into the church where the writer and his family worshipped, some wandering inclinations appeared, in its pastor, to the adoption of portions of the liturgy of a sister church; and the "*Gloria Patri*," &c. was introduced,—all the congregation standing up. However piously these things may be regarded, by those long in their practice; or however acquiesced with by others, as in their nature indifferent; yet, when taken into view, as connected with other circumstances, involving some important interests of the church, they could not be considered in that light by your addresser; though his dis-

approbation was manifested only by non-compliance. A superstitious respect to a particular part of the same act of worship, was enough to require such a course, from any one aware of its common effects; but it appeared also a servile imitation of others, and unsanctioned by that "DIRECTORY" which the pastor, and indeed every member of that church, was solemnly pledged to maintain. The love of novelty, and the influence of fancy, are ever working changes; and are not restrained by the sanctity of any table of duties, though inscribed by the finger of God. Hence those additions that obscured, or overwhelmed, first the worship, and finally the knowledge of the Deity, in all ages. But the nature of true worship, like the nature of its object, changes not.

If the adding to, or the taking away from, the code of divine revelation, be laid under the most awful prohibition, can any change in the immediate act of address to its Author, be of light consideration? To prevent this, have not the institutions of our church been established, with the utmost fear and caution? Is all this care to come to nought, under pretences of indifference, or even of merit? But, that you, and all, should be on the watch against these, there is before you the fullest exhibition, in the past history of the church, that things, equally as small, and by some as much commended, brought in

again and again, have actually changed and corrupted all religion throughout the world; even so far as to bring down the visitation of God, to cleanse his temple from things esteemed indifferent, or sanctioned by men as useful. Yet they, who oppose the introduction of innovations, are stigmatized by the *wise* and *zealous introducers*, as men of narrow and bigoted minds; superstitious, and rigidly moulded in antique casts,—without the pleasing refinement that abates the spirit, and exalts the forms, of modern devotion! It is true, that “wisdom is justified of her children;”—such presumptions might be scorned; those advancing them may be pitied; but no man, who feels that his responsibility rests where the changeful dictations of human fancies will never be admitted, can easily permit himself to be borne along by the throng of innovators, or silenced when conscience bids him remonstrate against them.

Innovations, in such a spirit of triumphant self-complacency, are seldom complimentary to individuals, or to their impressions, however pure or pious. Thus, when all things were prepared, without further notice, instruments of music and chorus-singing were speedily introduced, without either congregational or Presbyterial sanction, constitutionally obtained. So that those who were taken by surprise, and precluded from pri-

vileges by the measure, and who could not bend to the imposition of being arbitrarily bereft of their privileges, were left to take their course, *in any new direction*, with “ Providence their guide.”

That an instance of this kind should induce others, actuated by similar views and motives, to avail themselves of the precedent, was to be expected. Such as are conscious to themselves of any dereliction of duty, concur as readily with similar innovators, as these, on their part, do with such an example. Accordingly, another congregation, in the bounds of the same Presbytery, soon introduced this mechanical Organ-service; not only without obtaining the sanction or assent of the Presbytery, but in direct opposition to some of its most pious and faithful members; and that, too, in defiance of discord and separation.

That such proceedings should have occurred in the bosom of one of your judicatories, where so many watchmen are placed to guard the important interests of the church, and the constitutional standards they are so solemnly pledged to maintain in all their primitive purity,—to one individual, at least, appears wholly unaccountable.

However well founded these impressions may be, and however much to be regretted the effects which such proceedings are calculated to produce, and actually have produced,

it is nevertheless admitted, that a presumption might be indulged by some, that no violation of the Constitution had taken place; and that every Presbyterian congregation, under your jurisdiction, was at liberty to new-model its own public worship, as it suited their own particular taste and circumstances. That there are many who consider themselves under no restrictions in this respect, is pretty evident; and it is not easy to conceive how it should be otherwise, when palpable deviations either pass unnoticed, or are tacitly acquiesced with, by those whose solemn duty it is, not only to pray for, but to watch over and guard, the purity of our constitutional principles.

It is a serious consideration, that though there be probably no system of church government more congenial than our own with the principles practised on by our Lord and his disciples, or that affords more free and ample means for procuring a redress of any hardship, under which an individual may be brought, in the due exercise of his religious privileges; yet such is the predominance, acquired and acted on by some pastors, in large and influential congregations, as to absorb every idea of an appeal to the judicatories of the church; and, consequently, their will and decision become often as arbitrary, and as well supported by those who join them, as if they were '*diocesan*' bishops.

This, to some, unacquainted with all the circumstances on which it is founded, may appear to be too severe an animadversion. It is indeed hoped and believed, that instances which would justify it are rare in our churches. But this neither invalidates the case here submitted, nor alleviates the injustice of the innovations, to which the author of these remarks, as well as others, was subjected. On the contrary, the more generally the great body of the church enjoy its purity and its privileges, guaranteed to them by its constitution, the more grievous must a deprivation be felt in any corner of its extended pale.

Whatever reasons formerly recommended silence on this interesting subject, the present is viewed as a fit occasion,—*not yet out of season*,—for the observations now offered. The correctness of former impressions might not have been without some doubt. But these are now revived and strengthened by an accession of light and information; which, it is to be regretted, were not derived from that quarter where we might have supposed a still greater attachment to reformation principles existed; and where, on other subjects and occasions, steps were soon taken to guard against the innovations of some of those transatlantic churches, whose uncorrupted constitution we had here adopted.

The able and luminous discussion in the

Presbytery of Glasgow, in Scotland, to which this is annexed, has amply justified the impressions before entertained on the subject. These appear to be now sanctioned by an authority, as well as by abilities and arguments, which, it may be presumed, no friend to the reformed purity of Presbyterian worship, can feel disposed to controvert. They are not particularly adapted to the state of the church as established in Scotland; but are equally so to all who have vowed to serve God in consonance with the same "DIRECTORY" for public worship, in every part of the world.

Laying aside all consideration of what is local or national in that learned and liberal discussion, the introduction of instrumental music into any Presbyterian church, or indeed into any Christian church founded on the principles of the Reformation, is, above all controversy, proved to be without New Testament authority; and is therefore in opposition to the true tenour and spirit of the Gospel of Christ; as well as to his ever-blessed example and practice, when he led his disciples away from the splendour of the temple service, and instructed them, that, separated from the embellishments of worldly pomp, those who acceptably worship God, must worship him "in spirit and in truth."

It is rendered equally evident, that Organ-service is in opposition to the "Directory

for Public Worship ;” and consequently, that no minister in connexion with the Presbyterian church, and much less any Presbytery or Synod, under ordination vows to support or accord therewith ; could, *innocently*, or constitutionally, consent to its introduction, in public worship.

To plead that the “ Directory” does not, expressly, prohibit the use of Organs ; and that their introduction is, therefore, no violation of that part of our constitution ; would be only a wanton trifling with sacred things, with vows and obligations. Upon such reasons, it is not easy to see how much may be introduced ; or what, that is absurd and erroneous, can be excluded. But our Catechisms, in showing what is forbidden in the Second command of the Decalogue, expressly assign a prohibition of all “ will-worship,” and whatever is unsanctioned by the word and practice of Christ, and his apostles.

There is still an argument, that will have its proper weight with the pious, whose affections towards God are inseparably accompanied with the truest sympathy and concern for their fellow men. Of this the learned and able opponents of Organ-worship, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, seem not to have availed themselves ; at least to its full extent. Not only the spirit of the Gospel, but that worship also which it in-

roduced in place of the temple-service, were, uniformly, characterized by our Saviour's example and instructions, as equally adapted to all men, under every possible circumstance; but in a more especial manner, to the poor of this world. A mode of social worship, adapted to the pride or to the taste of the affluent, and wholly unattainable by the poor, has no foundation or sanction in the Gospel of the Son of God: and when the expense of Organs, and the talents necessary for any harmonious accompaniment of the service, is considered, it cannot be too much to assert, that such a mode of praising God is unattainable by most of the churches in this or other countries. Indeed, most of the vocal performers are silenced, and the poor have retired to other churches, or to different employments, on the Sabbath. For, shall it be allowed us to say, "That the yoke is no longer easy, nor the burden light?"

Something has been said to the contrary of all this; for something must be said—That many, for instance, are induced to attend the church by the charms of improved music; and that some, who seem to decline joining vocally in the praises of God, may lay aside their reluctance, from whatever cause it arises, and take their part in unison with the instrument. This is not the fact, and is contrary to the nature of men; who indeed

catch a sympathetic enthusiasm from each other, but in private or public, in as far as divine worship is concerned, manifest great coldness to instrumental music,—as every day's observation evinces. A few *amateurs* may, indeed, be induced to display their vocal powers and attainments; or join the harmony of sounds they admire; but it can hardly be said they add to the number of worshippers, though they may to the audience of the minister. Indeed, it is not uncommon to find, in some of our churches, men of no approved manners, taking the lead in this way, in the most solemn parts of our devotional service; too plainly disclosing an impious taste and propensity of preferring musical skill in the worship of God, to piety of principle, to the worship of the affections, and the devotion of the soul.

It may not be amiss to consider the length of time in which the primitive purity of the church continued, not only without the favour of the world, but under its derision and hatred. It never conciliated the great and fashionable, the tasty and refined, by accommodating itself to their desires and fancies. It subdued them by the simple spirit of goodness, and the power of truth, which scorned all artifice. But, when Imperial pride joined its vain parade, and when the world courted, it forsook its Master; lost its original brightness and simplicity; sought

an artificial and gaudy splendour; soothed and swelled itself with pompous, but empty sound; increased in ceremonies as it lessened in piety;—and, instead of salvation, brought *subjection* and slavery upon men. That in our so favoured land, where lordly power has lost its dominion, its tinsel glitter, affected mien, and worthless pretensions, which appear as the broken image of Dagon, in church and state, before our nobler, simpler institutes,—that there should be a friendly feeling towards the debasing influence of such mixtures, must excite shame as well as regret. But, how should *they* feel, who have participated in it, in the very face of solemn obligations to the contrary?

It may be said, that the decision of a foreign and distant Presbytery, with which we have no connexion, and over whom we have no jurisdiction, can be no precedent for us; and, therefore, can render any innovations of ours, neither more nor less valid. This is an objection only to authority, and not to the sanctions of reason or revelation. It might have some weight, perhaps, were that foreign Presbytery not a portion of the same church of Christ; or founded on other principles, sanctioned by any other authority, or regulated by any different standards than those which we also have solemnly adopted. But as in all these we are perfectly one and the same, however unconnected and sepa-

rated in other respects, such an objection, we cannot but suppose, neither will, nor ought to have weight with intelligent minds. It certainly cannot be said, that we have any greater temptations to indulge in a gaudy and pompous worship than those to which they are exposed. As little do our manners and habits, or the example of neighbours, or the distinction of ranks,—so coveted by the vain, but wisely *brushed* away from even our civil concerns,—afford any plea or pretext for such disquieting innovations.

Indeed, the very reverse of what they experience in these respects, is our happy situation. For though we may have here and there a few, who are taken with the meretricious invitations of external show, even in sacred things; yet, the happy simplicity of our best principles, whether civil or religious, is, in many essential respects, more favourable to the purity of our “Directory for Public Worship,” than that which they possess:—and it might be added, than what was experienced by the Fathers of the Reformation, or enjoyed even by the apostles and primitive Christians themselves. To be insensible, therefore, of these blessings and privileges, or to neglect the maintaining of them, so far as to admit, or tacitly acquiesce with, any inroad in a quarter of that church with which we stand connected, is little less than apostacy; especially in the most hal-

lowed and vital part of our religion—the immediate worship of the ever-present God; before whom we are admonished not to act inconsiderately, but “to be more ready to hear than to offer the sacrifice of folly.”

This, it may be said, is speaking “with all boldness.” But it is the way in which we are commanded to speak the truth—and especially, when brought to the test, in behalf of religious truth, endangered by degeneracy and corruption.

But, if it be grating to some, let them remember the epithets of “bigotry, narrowness, and prejudice,” applied to those they first aggrieved, and then aspersed.

Liberality, is a just estimation of the essentials or circumstances of things, and their relative influence, according to the importance of the objects—treating the *little*, *lightly*; and the *great*, with *grave regard*. It indulges weakness and infirmity; but would lose its name and nature in countenancing folly or error. The transcendent importance of religious intercourse with the Lord of life, “the Holy One,”—forbids the light admixture of fancy’s forms. These must stand aloof, as the solemn, awful business proceeds. They will retire, unable to bear its weighty seriousness. But shall any claim the sanction of liberality, while they fly to the “paradise of fools,” because “to few unknown.”

In whatever light these strictures may be viewed, either by those to whom they are addressed, or by the public in general, it is sufficient for the author, that he is impelled by a conscious sense of duty in giving them publicity. Far from indulging an accusatory spirit, he has submitted, for years, to the grievance of which he complains. And though not unknown to those whose duty it was to remedy, or at least to alleviate the wrong; he, *at no time*, experienced this sympathy, much less any overture for convincing him of his error, in a Christian way, if error it was. On the contrary, he seems to have been deemed one, whose scruples might be troublesome to the changeful and assuming spirit of the period—And, though unstriving, yet preserving a countenance of disapprobation, too unpleasant and foreboding to be retained within the fold; and better cast out than preserved, in opposition to pastoral or congregational innovations, however unconstitutionally introduced.

J. M^c.

Baltimore, April, 1821.

COPY OF A LETTER

*To the Incorporated Committee of the Church, &c.
alluded to in the preceding Address, and to
which no reply was received.*

GENTLEMEN,

BALTIMORE, August, 1811.

In consequence of the change made in the service of the church, by adding instrumental music to the worship of God, I am *constrained* to perform that duty in the association of other Christians; and to abandon the pew which I have hitherto held, to your disposal.

Thus far, I suppose, you are the proper body to communicate with. But to whom may be addressed the observations which I feel inclined to offer, on the nature of the change, and the manner in which it has been compassed? I am sensible, that you may tell me it did not proceed from you, nor is within the proper sphere of your duties; and, as duties and powers are correlative, that the committee could have no power for that which was no duty. But as there is no one who appears to be principal, where many are participators; and where every one also may, and in as far as I know, does disclaim the responsibility for an act, the consequences of which are as yet unseen; and may be attended with an accountability that very few, who contemplate it, may be willing to incur; I must beg leave to express the thoughts and feelings, produced by that measure, to the body I am now writing to, and who certainly possess such influence in administering the

general affairs of the church, that an INNOVATION so considerable, could hardly be supposed to have taken place without their concurrence. If offence be given, and injury done, to the church of God, though every one who has contributed to it must bear their part of the condemnation, yet they who have authority and power, must answer doubly for the failure or transgression. Upon this acknowledged principle of divine precept, and human consciousness, whatever is chargeable to those who originated the measure, your body, as well as the pastor and elders to whom, under the congregation, the administration of the spiritual and temporal affairs of the church are committed, have no common share of blame, as well as the peculiar one of failure, or unfaithfulness, in official duty.

It cannot be expected that you will do less than justify the *deed*, and repel the imputation; which you may, perhaps, in the common way, style or denominate the offspring of narrowness of mind, and illiberality. But though I would neither violate charity by presumptuous censure, nor fail in meekness of manners while venturing to reprove; yet it becomes necessary to remonstrate, with plainness and decision, on a case affecting the rights of the congregation, and the interests of religion*—And, I may add, a procedure that flagrantly violates the common principles of society, as well as the peculiar ones of the Presbyterian church;—that rejects acknowledged principles, unsettles received and established usages, and abandons open and legitimate deliberation;

* This alludes to the innovation being unsanctioned by the proper authorities.

and substitutes a clandestine mode and a varying principle of expediency—for a *part*, to elude the combined judgment of the *whole*.

Are not all those, who have objections to external, mechanical, instrumental machinery, in the service of God, utterly contemned, overruled, and borne down by such a procedure as has been adopted, in placing an Organ in the church? Was any one ignorant that it would offend many? Was this offence to be given, and their rights to be suppressed, as of no consideration; and with the most contemptuous determination to introduce what was the purpose of a part of the congregation, through a private act of subscription, without deigning to propose it for the consent of the whole, to receive or hear objections, or allowing any free discussion of the measure? Has it not, *hitherto*, been universally held to be a principle of Presbyterian church-association, that a matter of such general concern, should be the subject of the whole congregation's consideration, judgment, and order? It has been said by one, whose station in the church ought to manifest peculiar caution and tenderness, "that it would not have been Presbyterian, to submit the matter thus to the congregation." Perhaps it is the first time this has been said openly, in any of our churches in America; and it behoves, therefore, all the Presbyterian congregations to look well to themselves, if they value their privileges. If an election of a pastor, elders, and a committee, can divest the people of all power and right to judge and determine on the regulation of the service of the church, they are under the most slavish subjection, and are left only with the privilege of choosing their masters. But, it may be apprehended that the

Presbyterian people will feel the refutation of such egregious assertions, in *themselves*; and by their powerful sentence put down the heresy. For what is there in the character or office of any, or of all of those, whereon to found such a usurpation? Neither bishops, ruling elders, committees, nor trustees, have any such powers attached to their offices, characters, or trusts.

The truth is, that the consciousness that this favourite object, of a few, could hardly endure the trial of a public discussion, dictated the surer mode of imposing it by a private engagement; and suggested the idea of justifying a hardy assumption of power, leading to the claim and avowal of one still greater; and thus showing more clearly than ever, the necessity for our constitutional standards of union, and the principles which they inculcate for adhering to those rules, provided for the considering, judging, and determining on every important matter affecting congregational interests, in the assembly of the people.

They who consider themselves aggrieved in this affair, are not concerned only for the displacement they suffer in the church. Injured, as they justly feel themselves, in their rights; and that perhaps chiefly by those received into the society as of yesterday; obliged to abandon the seats made almost sacred to them by years of devotional occupancy; and with recollections, also, retrospective on the humbler building on the same spot; but on which they never had dreamed that their rights would have been invaded, by their contribution to more comfortable accommodation;—how is it possible to be silent under such circumstances? Not only the violation of a cha-

ritable regard to themselves, the peace and union of the church, but the interest of religion itself, excite their apprehensions; and compel them to bear a testimony against the admission of unworthy and frivolous matters into the adoration of that infinite Spirit, who claims the heart and the thoughts, and rejects every operation for that purpose, merely external. It cannot, indeed, be the extravagant acknowledgment of any, that an Organ is introduced as affording any pleasure to the Deity; or, that empty sounds can be received by him, as acceptable worship. But they must have it in his worship, it seems, for the purpose of improving the music. But in what consists this improvement? and by whom is it required? "Who has required this at our hands?" It has never been demanded or prescribed by Him, who is "the way, the truth, and the life," of all Gospel worship. He has, at no time, complained of bad music in our truly devout service; but too often has had reason to denounce inattentive, heartless worshippers. There would seem, then, but little reason to doubt, that they who are so fond of music, mean to please themselves more than to please God. Thus, what ought in truth to be considered a mere luxurious sensation, they would view as sufficiently meritorious to have a place in the most solemn service of the church!

It might be viewed as invidious, to inquire, how far this reason or motive appears in the persons who *actually* join in the service; or in those who are, *usually*, silent hearers only. It might be equally so to surmise, that the musical taste of the parlour is too refined and exalted, to be subjected to the humble simplicity of the church. However this be, we presume that it is to the

truly devout worshippers alone, that any appeal should be made for the aid to be expected from the introduction of Organs into the solemn worship of the Most High.

As this worship requires not only the thoughts, but also the affections, being kept close to Him, while they utter the sounds of praise; so ought they not to be distracted by such attention as is necessary to the symphony with a musical instrument. Indeed we need hardly fear contradiction in asserting, that in as far as plain, easy, simple music is set aside, and a more artificial composition employed, so far is true spiritual worship decomposed, troubled, and interrupted. But the common music in our churches has seldom, perhaps never, disquieted the worship of any religious man, in the house of God. There, the most refined in the musical art, might not satisfy those who feel no devotion of the heart. It is a solemn and serious duty that all are called upon to perform there, and not the empty entertainment of the eye or the ear. But should this be preferred, and an undue respect to the luxury of sound be allowed to temper the spiritual service, the bad effects cannot fail to appear. Surely the countenance of him who is Lord of the church, cannot be expected in such worship. He cannot, will not be imposed on by pretences to improving his service; while, at same time, we are seeking our own pleasure in a way which he hath not appointed.

If a view to increase the number of attendants on public worship give influence to the measure, rest assured, that it is an unhappy policy, indeed, that never will be blessed, nor what it aims at

realized. The state of the churches which have long exercised such helps in devotion and attendance, sufficiently demonstrates the benefits afforded in both, or in either of these respects.

As nothing is more shocking, on reflection, than that of the idea of intelligent beings, professing to meet for the worship of an omniscient and holy God ; and yet mocking him by a *fictitious*, instead of a *real*, regard ; or by praising him in a way more adapted to their own amusement than to the purity of his worship ; so is it still an aggravation of this, when introduced in an unauthorised or unsanctioned manner. In such service, even the organist and bellows-blower are criminally made to attend to mechanical exertion, for the production of senseless sounds, while the praises of God are going on and they standing in his presence, for the purpose of pleasing or serving their fellow men. In what light can we suppose God to be looking down upon such a scene, where many are waiting on him only in appearance, but *in reality* serving themselves ? Let such things, therefore, as have no connexion with true devotion, be removed to where they may innocently be enjoyed. They have no business in our churches. Why should they who desire them, seek to place them there, to the annoyance of others, or to the general injury of the church ? Can they not be induced to attend in the house of God, unless it be rendered a more amusing place ? Even a thing, in itself indifferent, loses that nature, and becomes offensive, when either misused or misplaced : And misplaced every thing must be, and especially in public worship, if intended to gratify the proud and vain, rather than the humble and contrite

worshipper; or, in other words, that is better calculated to please men, than Him who is to be worshipped only "in spirit and in truth."

All the various appendages of instruments, choirs, chantries, dresses, altars, pictures, images, &c. &c.; that enormous mass of worthless things that overwhelmed religion, have, from time to time, been introduced under like specious pretexts of being innocent, and helpful to devotion; and as being in themselves solemn, decent incentives to piety and the service of God; producing reverence in the beholders and hearers, &c. But is it a truth of which Presbyterians require to be convinced, or even informed, that all these things became a noxious, pestilent heap, under which the religion of Christ long groaned, and had almost expired? Our ancestors at the Reformation, of immortal memory, cleared off the very rubbish of their ruins; and embraced only the rational and spiritual worship of Jehovah, in all the simplicity of spontaneous prayer, praise, and administration of the ordinances of the Gospel. And though splenetic wit, and interested prejudice, have designated the pure state of the Presbyterian church, as too bare, and "stript until it was torn;" yet the impartial word of revelation describes it differently; while the imaginary benefits, *fancied* by those who retained so much of that so well fitted to strike the mere external senses of men, have never been such as to afford any reason for regret for their rejection from our service in the sanctuary. If so, why should we attempt, even in a *legitimate* way, to bring them back?

The dishonest attempt to cheat mankind into a reverence of holy things, by show, and sound, and pomp, "has verily had its reward." To one

part of this system of vanity, however, we have long assented. We have indulged our clergymen with a sanctified-like costume, at which their predecessors of the Reformation would have spurned with indignation; not on account of the sable aspect of the vesture itself, but merely *from the consciousness* of their being in need of no such appendage,—merely external. To this indulgence we are now adding that of organs, and choral music. To be honoured with titular rank, degrees and dignities, comes in, next in course; so that by and by it seems that, step by step, we shall get back to the point from which we started at the Reformation; and thus verify the predictive taunts of all the enemies of the simplicity of the Gospel.

Here permit me to leave you, Gentlemen, with my very friendly respects, though with the feelings of an injured member.

Your obedient servant, &c.

J. M.



Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: June 2006

Preservation Technologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111



FEB 82

N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46952



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 578 303 9

